

# CODEX B AND ITS ALLIES

A Study and an Indictment

## PART I

BY

H. C. HOSKIER

AUTHOR OF

"CONCERNING THE GENESIS OF THE VERSIONS OF THE N.T." ;

"CONCERNING THE DATE OF THE BOHAIRIC VERSION" ;

AND EDITOR OF COLLATIONS OF "THE MORGAN GOSPELS," AND OF  
THE GREEK CURSIVES 157 AND 604 (700).

ὁ βίος βραχύς, ἡ δὲ τέχνη μακρὴ,  
ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὀξύς, ἡ δὲ πείρα σφαλερὴ, ἡ δὲ κρίσις χαλεπὴ.  
Δεῖ δὲ οὐ μόνον ἑαυτὸν παρέχειν τὰ δέοντα ποιέοντα, ἀλλὰ  
καὶ τὸν νοσέοντα, καὶ τοὺς παρεόντας, καὶ τὰ ἔξωθεν.

—Hippocrates (*Aphor. I.*)

# CODEX B AND ITS ALLIES

A Study and an Indictment

PART C

BY

H. C. HOSKIER

PART I

John

- i. 14. - και (ante αληθειας) B<sup>sol</sup>  
(Boh has the usual πενε μεθ' αληθειας, but sah ετι με.  
Neither use ουτος here.)

15. ο ειπων (pro ον ειπον) B\*C\* and N<sup>s</sup> (Orig?) and W-H  
txt (non R.V. Sod). Both coptics have "and crieth out saying"  
(ερχω αυτος). Taking verses 14 and 15 together there is  
some significance attaching to these things. Tisch does not  
quote copt for ειπων. At any rate the community of origin of B  
and copt is established (as against others) by verse 16 *init* where  
οτι *init* (for και of many) is also the reading of the coptics.

21. ου ουν τι ηλειας ει B<sup>sol</sup> vid (variant al.)

- ii. 17. >εστιν γεγραμμενον (pro γεγρ. εστιν) B<sup>sol</sup> cum Sod<sup>371</sup> et Chr  
Cyr (Ephr<sup>h</sup> ην γεγρ.), but against all the rest, and Oxyr<sup>347</sup>  
γεγραμμενος (sic) εστιν.

19. τρισιν ημ. (-εν) B<sup>sol</sup> et [W-H] Orig<sup>semel</sup> Tert 1/2 Amb<sup>rst</sup>  
(cf. sah), but against all others and Clem Orig<sup>5+</sup> Eus Chr Cyr  
Iren<sup>int</sup> (Eust 47 with Ign δια τριων ημερων).

[Thereagainst in verse 20 B has εν with the mass and N a c  
omit with Clem.]

23. εν τω πασχα τη εορτη (-εν sec.) B<sup>sol</sup>

- iii. 16. του υιου (-αυτου) NBW soli (et W-H, non R.V. Sod) Not  
even L or T<sup>b</sup> nor Ψ nor 892 nor Paris<sup>97</sup> nor even 33 omits in  
this important place; nor d which begins again just here. In  
fact syr sin insists thus: "His Son His only," and sah "His  
Son His only Son," and Tertullian is clear.

Having once stated this in verse 16, there is not so much  
harm in omitting αυτου in verse 17 as do NBLT<sup>b</sup> W fam 1 22  
262 2<sup>pe</sup> (Sod) Sod<sup>111</sup> Cyr Ath.

34. - το πνευμα B\* et h<sup>scr</sup>? syr sin? soli vid

- iv. 5. +τω (ante Ιωσηφ) NB soli vid [W-H]

11. - η γυνη B and syr sin only (see under Syriac).  
W-H txt omit then alone with B. R.V. and Sod restore it.  
N\* substitutes εκεινη for η γυνη.

40. συνηλθον ουν (pro ως ουν συνηλθον) B<sup>sol</sup> cf. e inter latt.

42. δια την λαλιαν σου B<sup>sol</sup> cum Orig<sup>bia</sup>, contra N<sup>e</sup> rell pl δια την  
σην λαλιαν et Orig ex Heracl. (δια την σην μαρτυριαν N<sup>s</sup> D b d l r)

46. ηλθεν ουν παλις εν κανα (pro ηλ. ουν παλ. εις την κανα)  
B<sup>sol</sup> (nec mutav. correct.) cum N Sod<sup>1043 1443</sup>. See under "Change  
without Improvement."

52. την ωραν εκεινην (-παρ αυτων) B<sup>sol</sup> cum boh<sup>N</sup>. NACDKUP  
and W have την ωραν παρ αυτων,  
and LΓΔΛ unc<sup>1</sup> have παρ αυτων την ωραν with Chr Cyr. (Sod<sup>1-34</sup>  
την ωραν, -παρ αυτων but without εκεινην which B has.)

*ibid* fin. αυτην (pro αυτου), of the boy, by BA, simply an error. I  
might point out that even here B has the countenance of

John

another MS, yet it is an error common to both (*αυτο* 892). Instead of grasping therefore at *any* support for B readings, and where support is found, of adopting them, let us be a little more circumspect.

The prophecy which I adventured on page 12 has come true. Observe that *von Soden's* witness δ 371 (a MS at *Sinai* No. 260) now supports B's hitherto unique *θρονηντες* in Luke xxiv. 37, and that *Sod*<sup>143</sup> (a MS at *Athos*, Pantel. 28) supports B's theft in John ix. 6 of *επεθηκεν* (for *επεχρισεν*) from verse 15. See also John viii. 59 — δε B now supported by W.

† v. 7. *προς εμου* (*pro pro emou*) BL only and *St.* 1550 *txt.* This seems to destroy the sense and give the opposite sense. See Winer (*Moulton* edition, p. 467).

*W-H* reject all the last seven readings which I have cited for B.

14. — *ο* (*ante Iησους*) B et [*W-H*]  
 17. — *Ιησους* NBW 314 892 *Sod*<sup>3871</sup> (*male de*<sup>1279</sup> ? = *Laura*<sup>A104</sup>) *solī vid et* [*W-H*]. (The *aeth* inserts *Dom. Jesus* after *et respondit et dixit iis*, *q* has *et respondit illis Jesus*.) Otherwise all MSS and versions have it in an early position.  
 19. — *ο ιησους* B c<sup>scr</sup> *Eust* 47 *Tert.* This time without the agreement of LW or 892. In square brackets in *W-H*. No versions omit here either.

But then if *Tert* is to be of weight here, why not at verse 25 where he omits (both in *Prax* and *Res*) *και νυν εστιν* with *Σ* and *a b*, but as B does not do it, Westcott and Hort fail to exhibit this "shorter" text even in their margin. Had B joined here for omission they would of course have left it out. Can anything be clearer that it is B and nothing else but B which they consider "neutral."

Observe again verse 27 > *και κρισιν εδωκεν αυτω εξουσιαν ποιειν* by *Σ* alone (for *και εξουσιαν εδωκεν αυτω κρισιν ποιειν*) is exactly the method of *Tert*<sup>Prax</sup> "et iudicium dedit illi facere in potestate." This may be wrong, if you will, but in the next verse but one, verse 29, *W-H* avail of a "nicety" of B alone of Greeks, as it is supported by *Tert* and *sah a e ff Aug* (against *Iren*<sup>int</sup>) to omit *δε* in the second of the pair of clauses, printing *οι τα φανλα* instead of *οι δε τα φανλα* of all other authorities. The new MS W has *και οι* for *οι δε* (with *m boh<sup>pl</sup> syr arm Iren*<sup>int</sup>). We come back to the same old thing of some marginal remark in the parent of these Egyptian copies which led to change.

John

- v. 45. + *προς τον πατερα* (*post ο κατηγορων υμων*) B<sup>sol</sup> *inter omn.*  
 On the other hand observe *syr cu* (alone of the versions) omits

† This must be a "sunspot" according to Souter ('Text and Canon,' 1913, p. 22). "Little things," however, "show how the wind blows."



John

*προς τον πατερα* occurring previously, and deletes it altogether from the verse, as only *Ambr<sup>th</sup>*.

vi. 17. See under "Order."

22. See under "Form."

46. -του (*ante θεου*) B 258 *Cyr* [*W-H*] (*cf. copt*). Here the article seems to be needed. *Σ* *Sod*<sup>190</sup> and *Syn*<sup>ant</sup> substitute *τον πατρος* in reduplication of the beginning *ουχ οτι τον πατερα εωρ.*, and where some *Chr* *codd* substitute on the other hand *τον θεου* while *ND a b d e* substitute *τον θεον* for *τον πατερα* at the end of the verse. (*Evan* 248 *Sod*<sup>1094</sup> substitute *παρ αυτου* for *παρα τον θεου*).

50. *αποθνησκη* (*pro αποθανη* *rell omn et Orig Thdt*) B *Eus W-H*  
*mg* (*τεθνηξεται Clem<sup>Theodot</sup> αποληται Ψ*)

† 53. -ο (*ante Ιησους*) B *et* [*W-H*]

58. *εξ ουρανου* (*pro εκ του ουρανου*) BCT 892 *Sod*<sup>371</sup> (*et W-H*) but against all others and *Orig Eus Cyr*.

† vii. 1. *Ιησους* (-ό) B *et* [*W-H*]

3. See under "Coptic."

6. *παρεστιν* (*pro εστιν*) B<sup>sol</sup> See under "Improvement."

22. *ουκ* (*pro ουχ*) B\*

23. +ό (*ante ανθρωπος*) BN *Sod*<sup>1050</sup> 33 p<sup>scr</sup> 597 *Sod*<sup>1222</sup> [*non al. vid.*] [*W-H*]

34. See under "Coptic."

37. *προς εμε* (*pro προς με*) B  
(*Om. προς με ND b d e Cypr Viet Aug 2/3 Tisch*)

42 *init. ουκ* (*pro ουχ vel ουχι*) B\*N *sol*  
(*ουχ L<sup>T</sup> Orig W-H; rell ουχι*)

† viii. 12. *Ιησους* (-ό) B

† 25. *Ιησους* (-ό) B (*h<sup>scr</sup>+*)

† 34. *Ιησους* (-ό) B 314

† 39. *Ιησους* (-ό) B

*ibid. ποιετε* B 604 *ff vg* (*seq. εστε*) *et W-H txt* *Cf. Orig qui lectt in commune habet.*

† 42. *Ιησους* (-ό) B *Sod*<sup>178</sup>

*ibid. +ό* (*ante πατηρ*) B<sup>sol</sup>

58. *Ιησους* (-ό) BC e<sup>scr</sup>\* Paris<sup>97</sup> *et W-H*

59. -δε BW *sol* *cum vg*<sup>QR</sup> [*non W-H*]

ix. 7. See under "Homoioteleuton."

27. +ουν *post τι* B<sup>sol</sup> *cum aeth et georg et boh<sup>uno</sup>* (*et W-H marg*)  
See under "Coptic."

35. *Ιησους* (-ό) NB *et W-H*

† 41. *Ιησους* (-ό) B

† In all these cases *W-H* insist upon enclosing *ό* in square brackets in their text.

John

x. 1. > υμιν λεγω B<sup>sol</sup> cum pers contra MSS omn et verss rell et contra Clem Chr Cyr Orig<sup>int</sup> et Lucif.

7. Ιησους (-ό) B 118 [non fam] et [W-H]

> υμιν λεγω B<sup>sol</sup> pers ut solet again, showing that in verse 1 it is absolutely premeditate. I cannot fathom the reason for it.

In a dozen instances previously in this Gospel B has made no change; nor does he change on the next occasions at xii. 24, xiii. 16, 20, but at xiii. 21 he writes again υμιν λεγω (against Orig<sup>int</sup> and Ath<sup>al.</sup>) and none of Soden's sympathetic MSS join B either at x. 1, 7, or at xiii. 21; at xiv. 12, however, he leaves λεγω υμιν alone as at xvi. 20, 23; nor does he seem ever to vary λεγω σοι on the half dozen occasions where this occurs except at Luke xxiii. 43, where BC\*L arm pers have αμην σοι λεγω. Observe Origen with MWΔΠ latt for υμιν λεγω at Matt xxi. 27, and W alone at Matt xviii. 19 for υμιν λεγω. The noteworthy thing about B in Matthew is that he uses the order αυτω ειπεν with pers in xv. 15, and soon after at xvi. 4 has αιτει for ζητει alone of Greeks with pers<sup>int</sup> arab<sup>int</sup>. Cf. **N** pers soli Matt xviii. 19 αυτοις γενησεται. All in the same Semitic Gospel and W and **N** in the same chapter and verse in different phrases. (Cf. Luc xii. 22 where υμιν λεγω is probably original).

John

x. 18. ταυτην εντολην (pro ταυτην την εντολην) B<sup>sol</sup> cum Sod<sup>1060</sup>.  
(Error ex homoiotel. vel ex lat.)

23. Ιησους (-ό) B } et [W-H]

25. Ιησους (-ό) B }

32. > πολλα εργα εδειξα υμιν καλα B<sup>sol</sup> vid cum Sod<sup>541</sup> (Patmos 92)

This order is otherwise unique among the Greeks. **NAKΛΠΨ** Ath etc. Sod<sup>int</sup> have πολλα εργα καλα εδειξα υμιν, DLXIΓΔ and most have πολλα καλα εργα εδειξα υμιν, while W 220 *Eust* 54 b gat syr sin Tert Thdt omit καλα, and 127 and 245 *Eriph* omit εργα. The omission of καλα by W 220 *Eust* 54 b gat syr sin and Tert may be basic. The copies were evidently marked in the margin, and B shows this by slipping in the word later than the place in which it belongs. His order and his reading can certainly not be called "neutral," although Hort actually follows B here in his text, which he invariably does when a variety of readings confront him, and he clings to B to help him out of the difficulty of choice. But the result is only to get further into the mire of idol worship. Souter's edition of the R.V. condemns Hort by going back to the textus receptus and printing πολλα καλα εργα εδειξα υμιν with D and the majority. As a matter of fact the versions point on the other hand to the order of the **N** group, and W joins b and Tert for suppressing καλα altogether. (Tischendorf and von Soden forget to mention Tertullian).

I notice this matter at some length, because basic principles are involved. And these are that in a question of varieties of order, with omission of a word by some, the probabilities are, first, that the omission is neutral, and the word has been supplied from marginal indications,

or, second, that the omission is an error from carelessness and the matter mended from marginal observations.

In both cases the margin supplies the missing word.† Mrs. Lewis has very clearly stated this truism (Old Syriac Gospels, 1910, p. vii.) which I have quoted on p. 380 of my *Genesis of the Versions*.

But I am sick and tired of being told that Hort's methods are sound, his principles good, and his text the best yet published, when again and again he falls into a common trap like this, and follows a singular variety of order read by B alone, while the facts show that the order in B has been caused by the addition of a word out of the regular order, doubtless from marginal indications.

How entirely unscientific are the principles involved can be seen from the passages we have adduced within one chapter (x.) and within eight verses (18/25). Here is the record:

John x. 18. *ἦρεν* (*pro aipei*) NB quite alone and W-H. Cast out by the Revised Version text.‡

† Observe beyond at xviii. 40 under this head, and under "Order" at iv. 9, vii. 12, 33, xviii. 2 and xviii. 5.

A small matter will illustrate this. St. John x. 42, being a very short verse at the end of the chapter, we read the tiny verse with thirteen variations:

πολλοι ουν επιστευσαν εις αυτον εκει	W sol
και πολλοι επιστευσαν εις αυτον εκει	NBDLX <sup>9</sup> 1 38 157 213 248 249 x <sup>9</sup> <sup>er</sup>
	Paris <sup>97</sup> al <sup>90d</sup> d vg <sup>D</sup> sah boh arm aeth W-H.
και πολλοι επιστευσαν εις αυτον (- εκει)	118-209 pers boh <sup>122</sup> syr pesh sin it omn (praeter d δ) vgg omn.
και επιστευσαν εις αυτον πολλοι (- εκει)	Sod <sup>1443</sup> vid
και επιστευσαν πολλοι εις αυτον εκει	AK ?MUN fam 18 254 c <sup>9</sup> p <sup>9</sup> w <sup>9</sup> goth Sod.
και επιστευσαν εις αυτον πολλοι εκει	280 vid
και επιστευσαν εις αυτον εκει πολλοι	X <sup>b</sup> (= Sod <sup>144</sup> , Munich 208) vid
και επιστευσαν πολλοι εις αυτον (- εκει)	K ? 16 (sol inter gr)
και επιστευσαν πολλοι εκει εις αυτον	EGHSTAA minn mull txt rec δ
και επιστευσαν εκει πολλοι εις αυτον	28 285 a <sup>9</sup>
και εις αυτον επιστευσαν πολλοι εξ αυτων	(- εκει) arab (sed hab. εκει codd <sup>211q</sup> )
πολλοι τοιουν επιστευσαν εις αυτον	Chr <sup>90d3</sup> quattuor
πολλοι εκει επιστευσαν εις αυτον	Chr <sup>90d3</sup> lan

K? (Scholz) *Evan* 16 118-209 (Lake) Sod<sup>1443</sup> with all the Latins [except d δ] and syr pesh with syr sin and pers and Chr omit εκει altogether. If εκει belongs in 40 fin. (syr sin and pers transfer it to the beginning of verse 41) εκει may well be redundant at the end of verse 42. At any rate we have latt and syr this time combined [without D d] against all the Greeks [but *Evan* 16 118-209 Sod<sup>1443</sup>] for omission where the others vary the order [see further in xviii. 2]. The inference is that εκει came in from the margin, but very long ago (the ms 249 adds εκει in the following passage in xi. 1).

"Readers often made notes in the margin of a ms. Now it was a pious exclamation; now a parallel passage from another book; now an antiquarian note, or the expression of a difficult phrase. Such notes often found their way into the text, and sore is the resulting confusion."—(Canon Glassbrook: 'The next Revised Version,' Contemporary Review, May 1913.)

At John x. 38 just above, a most difficult place to judge, John Damascene conflates three readings: *ἰνα γινωτε, και πιστευσητε, και επιγνωσκητε*.

‡ See under "Change of Tense."

John

- x. 25. *οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε* (*pro ου πιστευετε*) B 4 (33) 71 157 and several other cursives *Sod*<sup>1094</sup> *f Ch*<sup>1</sup><sup>codl</sup> 2/7 and our *A.V.*, NOT followed by *W-H* †
32. *κατα post υμιν* B alone with *Sod*<sup>541</sup> and *W-H*. Cast out by *R.V.* ‡

The examples of change in x. 18, 32 are not allowed in the *R.V.* text representing Hort's own closest followers. The third case (x. 25), occurring between the two others, where he does *not* follow B, is a case where he certainly *should have* followed B. Not only has B quite respectable support for the reading, but grammatically it must have appealed to Hort: "*ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς (ὁ) Ἰησοῦς· εἶπον ὑμῖν καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε.*" So writes B. "I told you and ye believed not," exactly as our version of 1611. It would really seem as if Hort had some spite against King James' translators, for when he *can* follow them (B *teste*) he refuses to do so. § He prefers to reject B and its supporters for a rapid transition of tense: "*εἶπον ὑμῖν καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε,*" "I told you and ye believe not."

Need I say more concerning such a non-principled and unscientific base for Hort's structure? Brick by brick it is crumbling, but it is not creditable that it has taken so long for the "powers that be"—scholars in fact as well as in name—to see the weak points.

### *Solecisms (continued).*

John

- x. 34. *Ἰησοῦς (-ὁ)* BW *solī et* [*W-H*]
- xi. (See under other headings)
- xii. 3. *Ἰησοῦ (-του)* B<sup>sol</sup> *et* [*W-H*] Cf. xix. 38
- ibid.* *ἐπλησθη* (*pro ἐπληρωθη*) B<sup>sol</sup>. See under "Synonyms."
10. *ἐβουλευσαντο δε και οι αρχιερεις* B<sup>sol</sup> *cum vg*<sup>M</sup> *et goth* (than auk). Observe one *sah* ms which adds "the Jews." "Took counsel therefore [for *sah* with Greek MU and a few substitute *οὖν* for *δε*] the Jews with the chief priests."
12. *ο οχλος πολυς* (*pro οχλος πολυς*) BL *solī vid cum boh* (see under "Coptic") *et W-H txt* (*nil in marg*). Their phrase is *ο οχλος πολυς ο ελθων* for *οχλος πολυς ο ελθων*. Clearly an attempted "improvement." *Σ\*Δ* 2<sup>pe</sup> go at it another way, and subdue *ο* before *ελθων*, thus: *οχλος πολυς ελθων*. *Sod*<sup>7050</sup> *vid ο οχλος ο πολυς ο ελθων*.
13. *εκραυγασαν* B\*<sup>sol</sup> *vid* (and see under "Change of Tense")

† See under "Change of Tense."

‡ See here *supra*.

§ I do not mean that B is right, but that Hort's avowed principles, acted on constantly elsewhere, should have been followed by him here.

John

- xii. 18. Matter of order B<sup>sol</sup> *sah* See under "Order." Cf. also *boh*.  
 28. μου το ονομα (pro σου το ονομα) B and *Evan* 5 only. See under "Hopelessness of considering B neutral."  
 29. -ουν B<sup>sol</sup> and *sah*<sup>unus</sup> *boh*<sup>unus</sup> and *a* (and [W-H]) δε pro ουν W r.  
 46. -πας B<sup>sol</sup> *sol* See under "Syriac."
- xiii. 9. >πετρος σιμων B<sup>sol</sup> cum W (Note that in D *Sod*<sup>190</sup> 1131 & 470 *Eust* 32 σιμων is omitted, and in c<sup>scr</sup> *syr sin* πετρος is omitted; no doubt the change of order in B is the result of an addition. Just as in the previous verse, the order ιησους αυτω (for αυτω ιησους) by BACL *Orig* is probably due to original omission of αυτω as witness DC<sup>3P</sup> [teste *Sod non Lake*] 7 213 *Sod*<sup>1385</sup> *b d e l m boh arm*)  
 10. ιησους (-ο) B *Orig soli vid, et W-H*  
 18. εμε (pro επ εμε) B<sup>sol</sup> [See under "Change without Improvement" as to the rest of the verse]  
 19. πιστευητε BC *Orig* 1/2 See under "Change of Tense."  
 21. >υμιν λεγω B<sup>sol</sup> cum *pers* against all others and *Orig*<sup>1st</sup> *Ath*.  
 This is the third occasion of this. See above at x. 1 and x. 7. Hort neglects all of them.  
 23. Ιησους (-ο) B<sup>sol</sup>  
 26. " " BMW 314 } et [W-H]  
*ibid.* -το (ante ψωμιον sec.) B<sup>sol</sup>  
 27. Ιησους (-ο) BL et W-H  
 (36. Note also here Ιησους (-ο) BAC\*L *Sod*<sup>350</sup> 22 v<sup>scr</sup> *Sod*<sup>1178</sup> 1246 1443 against the mass.)  
 37. ακολουθειν (pro ακολουθησαι) BC\* *sol* et W-H. See under "Change of Tense." Note that B has ακολουθειν αρτι but C νυν ακολουθειν. (In 47 157 435 d<sup>scr</sup> v<sup>scr</sup> and the "Latin" codices 56 58 61 αρτι, which is the source of the change, is omitted.)
- xiv. 10. πιστευσεις B<sup>sol</sup> (See under "Coptic" and also "Change of Tense.")  
*ibid.* τα ρηματα α εγω (-λεγω) υμιν απ εμαυτου ου λαλω B<sup>sol</sup>.  
 16. η (pro μενη) fin vers post αιωνα B b *sol* vid et W-H marg. From the variety of positions which η occupies in B, N, LQX Cyr Did, whilst the μενη has to be accounted for as well, it is clear that η came from the margin, whether as a correction of μενη or not.  
 26/27. +εγω BL 314 *sol* (cf. X 33 127 *Sod*<sup>K1</sup> † εγω ειπον 26 fin.)

† This is a family of five mss (vol. i. p. 249) containing Cyril of Alexandria's commentary on St. John's Gospel. It is a nice link between B and Alexandria. Cyril seems to have placed εγω before ειπον, instead of after it as B does, in order to be sure that it came in 26 fin. and not in 27 init. See below again at xvi. 13 B with *Sod*<sup>K1</sup>.

John

See under both "Syriac" and "Coptic." *W-H* insert at end of verse 26.

- xv. 5. ουδε εν (*pro ουδεν*) B<sup>sol</sup> *vid.* Cf. *copt* (*om. D d*). See under "Form."
13. ουδε εις (*pro ουδεις*) B<sup>sol</sup> *vid.* Cf. *copt.* See under "Form."
7. ο αν θελητε (*pro ο εαν θελητε*) B<sup>sol</sup> *vid.* See under "Form."
10. - μου *tert.* B<sup>sol</sup> (*inter gr*). See under "Latin."
14. ὁ (*pro ἃ*) B<sup>sol</sup> (*inter gr cum Paris*<sup>97</sup>) et *W-H txt.* See under "Latin."
- xvi. 2. - υμας *sec.* B<sup>sol</sup> et [*W-H*]  
 (13. εις την αληθειαν πασαν BAY Sod<sup>K1</sup> soli cum Orig Did Cyr))  
 18. - τι λαλει B 213 397 *aeth soli et* [*W-H*] (*Vide infra xviii. 39, xx. 13.*)  
 19. Ιησους (- ὁ) BLW soli et *W-H*  
 31. Ιησους (- ὁ) BCW Sod<sup>750 1222</sup> † et *W-H*
- xvii. 1. Ιησους (- ὁ) NB [*non W*] Sod<sup>1222</sup> † et *W-H*  
 † 11. πατηρ αγιε *sic* (*pro πατερ αγιε*) BN soli. [*Sod neglects N.*]  
 Cf. xvii. 21, 24, 25. (See under "Change of Case.")  
 12. ημεν (*pro ημην*) B<sup>sol</sup> *haud dubie per incuriam, quia seq. μετ αυτων.*  
 15. - εκ του κοσμου αλλα ινα τηρησης αυτους B\*. [*Burgon quotes Athanasius for this ('Last twelve verses of St. Mark') but I cannot feel sure that this is beyond challenge. If so it is another link of B with Alexandrian copies where a saltus was made from αυτους to αυτους.*]  
 17. - τη (*ante ἀληθεία*) B<sup>sol</sup> *vid cum Cyr<sup>txt</sup> et Sod<sup>lam</sup> Cyr K1 (habet dis Cyr<sup>com</sup>).* See under "Latin and Coptic."  
*ibid.* + ἡ (*ante ἀλήθεια*) BW Paris<sup>97</sup> soli cum sah boh (*syr*). See under "Coptic."  
 21. πατηρ (*pro πατερ*) BDNW soli *vid et W-H* [*DW non in ver 11 ut B*]  
 24. πατηρ ( , , , ) BAN soli *vid et W-H* [*non DW, non Clem*]  
 25. πατηρ δικαιο *sic* BAN (πατηρ δικαιοι) soli *vid et W-H* [*non DW, non Clem*]
- xviii. 1. Ιησους (- ὁ) NBL\* soli *vid et W-H* [*non W rell*] (Cf. xviii. 23 et *alibi*)  
 2. See under "Order."  
 3. - εκ *sec.* B 314<sup>vid</sup> et [*W-H*] See under "Coptic." - εκ των NN<sup>ca</sup> etc.

† This is a codex at St. Petersburg. The other Sinai, Jerusalem, and Athos codices sympathetic to B elsewhere do not elide these articles in St. John if they have been properly collated for *Soden*.

† Cf. BN at iv. 46 εν κανα.

John

- xviii. 5. >εγω ειμι ιησους B a. See under "Order."  
 † 15. >γνωστος ην BW 4 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>3488</sup> W-H marg (with a  
 c f ff q r aur gat syr boh) See under "Order."  
 31. πειλατος (-ό) BC\* Sod<sup>3383</sup> soli et W-H

Since I have noted in this Gospel where B omits the article (alone or in a small minority group) before *Ιησους*, I note this also. It may be a concurrent version influence (which is the more probable and an error oculi) or carelessness, or a preference. The reader is capable of judging. But while at xix. 5 B omits *ό* before *Ιησους* and *ό* before *ανθρωπος* in the same verse, in both of these particular cases absolutely alone, Hort places [*ό*] before *Ιησους* in square brackets but leaves *ό* before *ανθρωπος*. What kind of editing is this?

36. -αν B<sup>not</sup> cum J<sup>vid</sup> Sod<sup>3381</sup> (as the versions; and cf. a b e aur vg<sup>13</sup>)

There is a treble variety of order here :

οι υπηρεται αν οι εμοι ηγωνιζοντο AD<sup>sup</sup> N and most Gr. with  
 q δ Orig 1/4 Hier<sup>eccl</sup> <sup>ms</sup>

οι υπηρεται οι εμοι αν ηγωνιζοντο c f ff g r vg<sup>12+</sup> aeth Aug, and  
 οι υπηρεται οι εμοι ηγωνιζοντο αν N<sup>1</sup> L<sup>1</sup> X<sup>1</sup> B<sup>margin</sup> W<sup>1</sup> Ψ 1-299 [non  
 209] fam 13 33 91 213 249 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>3110</sup> fam E. CN arm  
 Orig 3/4 Chr Cyr et W-H Sod txt,

the latter order probably being of an "improving" tendency. It is the order followed by Hort, who neglects the omission of *αν* by B.

39. -εν (ante τω πασχα) B<sup>not</sup> cum Sod<sup>52</sup> et [W-H] (Cf. aeth<sup>vid</sup>.  
 Cf. syr. Cf. q "per pascha." Cf. a om. εν τω πασχα.  
 Rell omn et sah boh + εν plane)

- { 40. -παντες NBLXW [non 28 male Scho Tisch] 71 213 249 348  
 435 j<sup>scr</sup> al. minn<sup>10</sup> Sod<sup>3110</sup> 1246 1443 fam K. CN Orig ?, but absolutely  
 no versions except *pers*, which Tisch and Horner neglect to mention, but which probably represents *syr sin* here. That document is wanting from xviii. 31-xix. 40. I merely record this matter here as W-H of course omit, and Soden omits. The omission of *παντες* has no other version support, and I do not think we can neglect *all* the Coptic and Latin codices in such a place. No reader of Hort's or Souter's edition of R.V. text would ever suspect that *παντες* occurred in *any* document! Probably the omission of *παντες* took place from misunderstanding a mark of deletion set against the word *παλιν* next to it, which word is omitted by GKUP many *lat*,

† I enter such a thing here, as hitherto B has been recorded alone for it. The entry will serve to call attention to the additional support, and its possible source.

John

*sah boh aeth arm syr pers arab.* This is why the versions have *παντες* and not *παλιν*, and I think are most likely right against *NBLXW* which dropped the wrong word. In order to show that *NBLXW* form but *one* recension here, consult xix. 3 only three verses further on, and observe the form used of *εδιδουσαν* by these mss and *Cyril* followed by *W-H* and *Soden* against the rest for *εδιδουν*. The family appears to be complete, *Soden* quoting *K<sub>1</sub>* as a whole for his five mss with *Cyril's* commentary (p. 249, vol. i.) besides *C<sup>24</sup>* (our 138.) A somewhat similar matter as to *παλιν* and *παντες* occurs at Mark vii. 14 to which Burgon calls attention in his "Causes of Corruption."

I do not think I am forcing an argument here by suggesting that a mark set between *παλιν* and *παντες* may have been mistaken for instructions to delete *παντες* instead of *παλιν*. There are many clear illustrations of such practice, and many other places where we can infer such a state of things. For instance, given the well-known and wonderful sympathy existing between *N<sup>gr</sup>* and *e<sup>lat</sup>*, it is interesting to observe that where *e* alone with *A<sup>4</sup> Sod* (= *X<sup>b</sup> Munich 208*) *syr sin pers* (*aeth*) omits *πρωτος* in John xx. 4 *N* alone is found to place it *after εις το μνημειον* instead of before it. This change of order in *N* doubtless grew out of the addition from the margin of *N* and *e*'s common (Graeco-Latin?) archetype of the missing word.

(See under "Order" at iv. 9, vii. 12 33, xviii. 2, 5, as to similar matters concerning B, and previously under this head of "Solecisms" at x. 32.)

John

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| xix. 5. <i>Ιησους</i> (-ὁ)                        | <i>B<sup>sol</sup> vid et [W-H]</i>  |
| <i>ibid.</i> <i>ανθρωπος</i> (-ὁ)                 | <i>B<sup>sol</sup> vid [non W-H]</i>   |
| 12. <i>αν</i> ( <i>pro εαν</i> )                  | <i>B<sup>sol</sup> vid [non W-H]</i>   |
| 28. <i>Ιησους</i> (-ὁ)                            | <i>B Sod<sup>1110</sup> [non W-H txt]</i>  |
| 30. <i>Ιησους</i> (-ὁ)                            | <i>BW et [W-H]</i>   |
| 38. <i>Ιησου</i> (-του <i>pr. loco</i> )          | <i>B et [W-H] Cf. xii. 3.</i>  |
| xx. 13. + <i>και</i> ( <i>ante λεγει αυτοις</i> ) | <i>B aeth arab soli vid [non W-H] (q. quae dixit, Eus η δε ειπεν. georg Tunc dicit. Rell omn λεγει αυτοις)</i> |
- Cf. B and aeth above at xvi. 18 and xviii. 39.*
- (15. *Ιησους* (-ὁ) *NBLW min<sup>tra</sup> W-H*; xx. 16 *Ιησους* (-ὁ) *BDLO<sup>1083</sup> W-H*; xx. 17 *Ιησους* (-ὁ) *BDLM\*Ψ W-H*; xx. 24 *Ιησους* (-ὁ) *NBD W-H* against *Cyr*; xxi. 13 14 *Ιησους* (-ὁ) *BC?D W-H* against *Cyr*)
17. > *μη απτου μου* (*pro μη μου απτου*) *B Tert verss aliq W-H<sup>ms</sup>*  
(see under "Order.")

† Compare shortly afterwards at John xx. 12 *N e* alone together omit *δυσ*.



John

- xx. 20. +*και* (*ante τας χειρας*) BA only and *W-H* (See under "Improvement.")
23. *τινος bis* (*pro τινων*) B *et W-H*<sup>ms</sup> See under "Latin," "Syriac," and "Change of Number."
29. *Ιησους* (-*ς*) B *et* [*W-H*]
- xxi. 1. *Ιησους* (-*ς*) BC *et W-H*
10. *Ιησους* (-*ς*) B *et* [*W-H*]
12. *Ιησους* (-*ς*) B *et* [*W-H*]
- (16. *τα προβατια* BC 19 22 *Sod*<sup>183</sup> *Theophan b et W-H txt*;  
xxi. 17 *τα προβατια* ABC *Ambr et W-H txt*)
17. -*αυτω tert.* B<sup>ψ</sup> 249 *ff Sod*<sup>N</sup> (*Niketas aman?*) [*non W-H!*]
18. *και αλλος ζωσει σε* B:<sup>ol</sup> *vid* (*cf. ord vers*)
24. *ο και μαρτυρων* (*pro ο μαρτυρων*) BW *et Cyr* (*soli vid*) *et*  
"*Ωρ*" *teste Soden* (*Cf. gat foss vg<sup>E</sup> vg<sup>add</sup> aeth + ille*)

The additional testimony of *W* here is completely neutralised by a consideration of the few late Latin witnesses which simply add *ille* for emphasis, as do BW *Cyr* when they add *και*. The silence of the rest speaks for itself and we close as we began with the perfect assurance that *B* is to blame for an infinite variety of small as well as large mistakes made in an effort to improve the record. Hort places this last variation in his margin.

### *Latin Sympathy.*

- iii. 36. *ουκ οφεται ζων* (-*την*) *ṠABCDT<sup>b</sup> W Paris<sup>97</sup> al.* ("non videbit vitam" *latt*) *W-H et Sod txt contra την ζωνν rell et Ign Const Bas<sup>vulgates</sup> Chr Cyr Thdt et copt.*
- v. 36. *δεδωκεν* (*pro εδωκεν*) *ṠBLNT et W 1 83 157 al. pauc. 892*  
[*non Paris<sup>97</sup>*] *Ath Cyr latt W-H Sod.*
- vi. 17. *εις πλοιον* (-*το*) *ṠBLΔ* [*non D nec W*] 33 113 131 213  
289 254 604 892 *Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod*<sup>337 1893</sup> *soli* with *Cyr W-H Sod txt*  
against all others and against both coptics.
49. See under "Order."
- vii. 4. *αυτο* (*pro αυτος*) BDW *d. Tisch* and *Soden* quote *sah boh* for this reading, but it is doubtful if one can read this into them. The Syriac is also doubtful. The "neutral" reading (*b e dim* (*r*) *aeth?* and (*boh*)) appears to omit both *αυτον* and *αυτο*. [*E<sup>\*</sup> 253* read *αυτον*, but the readings to choose from are clearly *αυτος*, or *αυτο*, or plain omission, and *αυτος* is undoubtedly right.] Hort consigns *αυτο* to his margin quite correctly, and Souter's *R.V.* edition follows suit. *αυτο* appears to be an "improvement."
6. *παρεστιν* (*pro εστιν in sec. loco*) B:<sup>ol</sup> and a few *vulgates*.  
See under "Improvement."

Joha

- vii. 22. σαββατω (-εν) B b e r soli  
 44. εβαλεν (pro επεβαλεν) BLT [non minn] W-H [non Sod] Cf. misit it<sup>91</sup> vg.
- viii. 55. ομοιος υμιν ψευστης (pro ομοιος υμου ψευστης) BADW fam 1 52 138 (= Sod<sup>C24</sup>) 157 254 2<sup>90</sup> et latt: *similis vobis mendax*. The dative is as legitimate as the genitive in Greek, but there must be some reason for the preference of the small group here. It is opposed by N and the rest including Ψ 892 and Paris<sup>97</sup> and Tert. See note under "Change of Case." Soden does not follow BADW.
- ix. 14. ην δε σαββατον εν ημερα (pro ην δε σαββ. οτε) NBLXW 33 213 (-ημερα) W-H<sup>txt</sup> Sod<sup>ms</sup> and c ff in qua die, a b r qua die, and e (in quo = 213<sup>97</sup>), syr hier and Cyr, while vg<sup>8</sup> conflates with in illo die quando. This is opposed by D and the rest and 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> and none of the other cursives know anything about it.
- Observe here that the coptics and other versions are also all against it,† and that the vulgate knows nothing of this matter of NB. Therefore the codex similar in other respects to NB (see Wordsworth and White's Preface) did not have this reading, which proves that 892 and Paris<sup>97</sup> here provide us probably with the real underlying text of NB, rather than NB themselves. Is it a Johannine improvement of NB? See John:
- v. 9. ην δε σαββατον εν εκεινη τη ημερα.  
 xix. 31. ην γαρ μεγαλη η ημερα εκεινη (δε εκεινου) του σαββατου }
- ix. 19. >βλεπει αρτι (pro αρτι βλεπει) NBDLUW 33 892 [non Paris<sup>97</sup>] W-H Sod txt b c d ff l syr sin hier pers [non syr pesh] Cyr Chr 1/2 (βλεπει νυν Chr 1/2) against the rest and against sah boh and the other versions.
35. ειπεν (-αυτω) N\*BDW d e boh<sup>uns</sup> W-H<sup>txt</sup> Sod<sup>ms</sup>, against all the rest and syr sin and all the versions.
40. >οι μετ αυτου οντες (pro οι οντες μετ αυτου) NBDLXWΨ fam 1 33 157 213 248 2<sup>90</sup> 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>all</sup> et Sod<sup>C(omn)</sup> (Sod txt et W-H) Cyr only of Greeks, but with all latt. The other versions vary.
- x. 12 init. ο μαθητος (-copula) BGLW 1 [non fam] a aur vgg<sup>91</sup> boh<sup>uns</sup> Lucif, against ο μισθ. δε by most and Eus Chr copt and versions, and ο δε μισθ. NDXΔ Sod<sup>ms</sup> Const Cyr.
16. >δαι με (pro με δαι) NBDLWΔΠΣ 1 [non fam] fam 13 33 348 w<sup>scr</sup> Sod<sup>285</sup> 1043 1266 1278 [non Paris<sup>97</sup> nec al. vid] it vg syr (sah)

† Syr sin however has: "And that same day was the Sabbath," cancelling the whole of the rest of the verse. While the Georgian version alone reverses the order of verses 13 and 14, placing verse 14 first.

*Orig<sup>int</sup> W-H Sod*, but against all the rest of the Greeks and *Eus Bas Chr Cyr* and *Thdt.*

- x. 17. > με ο πατηρ αγαπα (*pro* ο πατηρ με αγαπα) **NBDLXV** [*non* W] 33 213 248 249 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>quinque et txt</sup> *it vg Chr Cyr* against the rest (*M με ο πατηρ με αγαπα*; *Chr aur με αγαπα ο πατηρ*; *gat dim. cf. boh*) and *syr* diligit me pater. *Me diligit pater meus Auct de prom.*

18. ηρεν (*pro* αιρει) **NB** only and *W-H*. Not one single minuscule. See under "Change of Tense." Cf. *gat tullit.*

29. δ (*pro* δς) **NBLWV** *Eust* 15 *it vg boh* [*non sah*] *Tert* (*sed variant codd*) *Hil W-H et Sod txt.* *Contra rell et Cyr.*

- 32 *fin.* > εμε λιθαζετε **NBLV** Sod<sup>880</sup> 33 157 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>241</sup> 1110 1279 *et txt it<sup>91</sup> vg Ath* against *λιθ. με* of *DW* most and *c f d l δ goth boh sah syr Epiph Thdt Hil.* (*Tisch* omits to chronicle *sah boh* here against **NBL**).

40. εμενεν (*pro* εμεινεν) **B** 21 *solī, et a b c e ff l* [*non d f r δ vgg Aug (hiat q)*] (*εμειν W, rell εμεινεν*) *Om. και εμεινεν εκει syr sin*, or perhaps *om. εμεινεν* and use *και εκει* (as does *pers*) to begin the next verse.

- xiii. 2. ινα παραδ αυτον Ιουδας Σιμωνος Ισκαρ. **NBLMXX<sup>b</sup>** (= Sod<sup>A4</sup>) *W Laura<sup>A104</sup> (Sod teste) b ff g l gat vg arm Orig<sup>pluries</sup> W-H Sod txt,* against *Ιουδα Σιμωνος Ισκαρ. ινα αυτον παραδ.* *D rell omn, rell latt syr aeth* and *Origen* many times.

10. > ουκ εχει χρεϊαν **NABCWV** *a s q Orig<sup>quasi</sup> Tert Aug W-H Sod txt* against *ου χρεϊαν εχει* of *D* and all the rest *Chr Cyr* but only *d latin*. The other Latins express *non indiget* (*r* is not available), while coptic is **ⲡⲉⲣⲁⲭⲣⲓⲁ ⲁⲛ.**

19. See under "Order."

36. > ακολουθησεις δε (μοι) υστερον **NBC\*LX** 1 Sod<sup>183</sup> [*non fam*] 33 138 (Sod<sup>024</sup>) 213 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>190</sup> *Orig Cyr* and *Latin* order *W-H Sod txt*, against *DW* the rest of the Greeks (and only *d* of the Latins) *syr boh sah etc.* This place deserves some consideration. The alignment of authorities is peculiar.

- xiv. 31. εντολην εδωκεν μοι (*pro* ενετειλατο μοι) **BL** }  
and " δεδωκεν μοι ( " " " ) **X** 33 } [*latt praeter d δ*]  
and " μοι δεδωκεν *Cyr et b e g gat.*  
and εδωκεν μοι εντολην 2<sup>pe</sup> (*negl. Tisch*) 19<sup>ms</sup> (*εδωκε μοι ο πατηρ εντολην* 1 [*non fam*]).

This is an interesting place, where all the Latins, except *d δ*, favour **BLX** 33, while **N** and all other Greeks with *D* have *ενετειλατο* and *d δ* only of Latins *mandavit*, against *mandatum dedit* or *praeceptum dedit* of the rest (*Wordsw* neglects to mention *δ* definitely here). All the versions (including *copt syr*) are with the body of Greeks for *ενετειλατο*. Only

*aeth* favours BLX and the Latin. Add 213 (*Sod*<sup>129</sup>) *Sod*<sup>183 1110</sup> and compare his note. He avoids the reading in his text.

It is rather a crucial passage in connection with the "version tradition" which here narrows down to the *Latin*. As in verses 26/27 (see under "Syriac") we have just had another apparent version influence it will not do to put aside too contemptuously my views on this subject. Souter (J.T.S., Oct. 1911, p. 120) says of me: "The general theory which underlies his views is that a trilingual or quadrilingual copy of the Gospels existed in early times, the four languages represented being Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Coptic. He finds that this hypothesis, complicated as it is, explains certain individual readings in some Greek mss. He rejects without reason, as far as I can find, the simpler hypothesis that Greek copies behind the Latin, Syriac and Coptic versions were different to some extent from all surviving Greek copies."

Now my dear Dr. Souter, if my theory be complicated (and it is far less complicated than some others) it covers admirably cases like the present, where it is not a question of "Greek copies behind the Latin, Syriac or Coptic versions being different to some extent from all surviving Greek copies,"† for here we have three Greek uncials BLX and two cursives (33 2<sup>pe</sup>, of very critical repute [opposed here by Paris<sup>97</sup> and the other thousand] plus 1 and 19 *marg*) which give the reading of the Latins, WHICH THE REVISED VERSION DISAPPROVES, condemning it as a version tradition, and condemning Hort for adopting it, BECAUSE THAT TEXT GOES BACK TO *εὐαγγέλιον*. No doubt the latter is right. No doubt *κ* and the mass of Greeks with D (and *d δ* plus the versions) are right. Don't condemn me in this cavalier fashion then, if you please, but look into these matters a little more carefully. There is no note in your edition on this reversal of Hort in the Greek Testament, published in 1910.

Whenever Hort's decisions are reversed in such a publication a note is absolutely due and called for, in order that students may see what is the present eminent opinion on textual matters to date.

The evidence is withheld in several such passages, which is not a proper method, and I am surprised that the Delegates of the Oxford Press consented to issue the work without an apparatus covering the evidence in *all* the places where Hort's judgment and his readings are tacitly condemned, and where simultaneously B is condemned for falsifying the record.

Bear with me a moment longer. Look forward only two verses beyond. At:

† Different is the situation at xv. 21 where instead of *υμεν* or *υμας* BD\**LM*<sup>2</sup> 1 83 Paris<sup>97</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup> (*teste Sod*) W-H and *Sod* *tet* with *Petr*<sup>1110</sup> write *εις υμας*, while *b c ff l* write *circa vos* showing no Latin reaction on Greek from *circa*. However *d* has in *vos* as *syr*, and one *boh* as *ΕΡΩΤΕΙ*, instead of *ΝΩΤΕΙ*, for the plurality of *boh* and all *sah* with the other Latins are opposed to any preposition.

John

- xv. 2 *fin.* Hort reads *να > καρπον πλειονα < φερη* with BLMXΨ 33 157 213 397 *Sod*<sup>190N31</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> and *W-H Sod txt Eus Cyr Novat Hil Orig<sup>int</sup> syr pesh* and ALL THE LATINs in this order (N and *Clem* *καρπον πλειω*; *fructum multum e, fructum plus vgg* and *g aur gat*; *fructum majorem q, fructum ampliorem a d r, fructum plurimum b c f ff l foss*) but not † *d δ*, for *d* reads: *ampliorem frum* and *δ plus fructum* in the usual Greek order.

The Revision admits that Hort again followed the same version influence here, for the correct reading is adjudged to NDA the Greek mass and *d δ*, against BLMXΨ 33 157 Paris<sup>97</sup> and the Fathers, for in the Testament of 1910 *να πλειονα καρπον φερη* is printed, but there is no note on it, although you pause to tell us that earlier in the verse D *Cyr* (and *Clem*) read *καρποφορον* for *καρπον φερον*. [Since this was written it has become clear that *Soden* has no real critical principles either. His text is a curious exhibition of eclecticism (see below at x. 28, xiii. 26). Here he follows Hort.]

Oblige me once more by considering your theories—"on the foundation (which) they have laid the future will do well to build" ('Text and Canon,' p. 103)—in connection with this Oxford text. It reverses (with perfect correctness) the decision of BLMXΨ 33 157 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Eus Cyr Novat Hil Orig<sup>int</sup>* and *Westcott and Hort*, although you still pretend that their foundations are secure. But if wrong at xiv. 31 and at xv. 2, twice within three verses, may I ask why we should follow B and Hort in countless other places where they have far less support than here? We have simply come back to individual preferences. We are still floundering. We have no fixed principles of criticism. All the nonsense about "neutral" "pre-syrian" "Antiochian" fades away, and we must begin all over again. We need critical principles; and I claim to have established that we have none.

John

- xv. 9. > *υμας ηγαπησα* BDLΨ 1 [*non fam*] 33 ? 213 *Sod*<sup>141</sup> [*non Paris<sup>97</sup> non al. gr*] *a b d e ff q [non syr copt]* *W-H Sod txt.*  
Again abandoned by R.V.
10. *του πατρος (-μου)* B<sup>101</sup> *cum a b c ff q aur W-H Sod txt.*  
Abandoned by R.V. *Sod* adduces no new witness.  
[In all these places W is wanting. The ms lacks xiv. 25-xvi. 7.]
11. We must now add to this imposing list of Latin influence on B the present place where *ῃ* is substituted for *μελην* by BADΨ only of Greek uncials and by a few cursives. All the Latin (except *f*) have *sit*. Against them are N and the rest and

† Tischendorf obscures the situation by not specifically mentioning *d δ* as accompanying the mass of Greeks. He simply says *si vg* as a whole to accompany BLMX.

John

*Chr Cyr.* The versions may be "anceps" as *Tisch.* remarks as to Coptic, and *μεινη* may have come back from the repeated forms of *μενω* in the previous seven verses. We need not quarrel about it, but the place should be viewed in connection with the Latin influence at xiv. 31, xv. 2, xv. 9, xv. 10 just discussed, before we accept *Hort Soden* and *R.V.* here. (*Om.* 157.) Besides, consider the next place involved :

- xv. 14. *εαν ποιητε δ εγω εντελλομαι υμιν* B and Paris<sup>97</sup> alone of Greeks (against *α* and *οσα* of the rest and *Cyr*) with *a e q syr sin goth (Cypr) Lucif* 2/3. Some, as *Thdt* and *syr pesh aeth*, emphasise "all which." If B be correct all the rest have edited here, which is quite possible. *Hort* says they have, for his text has *δ* following B<sup>col</sup>, but the Oxford text of 1910 denies it, returning to *α* as does *Soden*. *Tales duces caeci.*
- xvi. 12. *>εχω υμιν λεγειν* NBLYΨ 33 118-209 [non 1] 213 *Sod*<sup>K<sup>a</sup></sup> *b c (e) f ff g l m q r gat vg Theogn Ath W-H Sod txt (Tert Cyr Hil Orig*<sup>int</sup> are on both sides), but all the rest oppose with *ΔΔ α δ δ* and coptic etc. for *εχω λεγειν υμιν* with *Eus Did Orig Chr Thdt*, and Paris<sup>97</sup> specifically with *λεγειν εχω υμιν*.
18. *μικρον (-το)* BLYΨN<sup>c</sup> 121 124 [non fam] 213 397 *Sod*<sup>1250</sup> <sup>1454 fam 48</sup> *Eust* 60 *Orig W-H (lat: pusillum vel modicum)* but as *μικρον* is employed by all Greeks in verse 19 without *το*, it is probable that *Orig* and BLYΨ are merely harmonising and improving here. *Soden* does not follow them here, although adding new witnesses, among them D which is wrong.
- xvii. 1. *-σου sec.* That is to say: *να ο υιος δοξαση σε* (instead of *να ο υιος σου δοξαση σε*) NBCW 47 64 *Sod*<sup>52</sup> K<sup>a</sup> [non Ψ non Paris<sup>97</sup> non min al. vid] *Orig* 1/2 *Victorin Hil* 1/2. I do not know whether I should place this here or not. Perhaps it is a doctrinal alteration, but the only support among the versions is from a small Latin band, viz. *d* (against D<sup>gr</sup>) *e* and *ff*. The other Latins and all the Versions with D and the rest of the Greeks supply *σου*, while *Origen* is divided and *Orig*<sup>int</sup> witnesses twice against the omission. *Soden's* text places *σου* in square brackets.
11. *αυτοι (pro οιτοι)* NB 229\*\* 254 *Sod*<sup>1110 1222 1395 8 371 459</sup> *soli vid cum d f W-H*<sup>int</sup> non *Sod (om. vg<sup>T</sup>)*. Cyril reads *οιτοι* with the mass.
- xviii. 6. *-οτι* NABDLNXII et WΨ fam 1 22 33 42 106 127 138 157 265 *Laura*<sup>A104</sup> *Sod*<sup>178</sup> 2<sup>pc</sup> w<sup>scr</sup> [non Paris<sup>97</sup>] and *it vg W-H Sod*, but against the rest of Greeks, the other versions, including the friendly *syr* and *copt* and against *Orig* and *Cyr*.
10. *ωταριον* NBC\*LXW (*pro ωτιον*) *Soden* only adds

one cursive *Sod*<sup>1088\*</sup> (a MS at Sinai) but follows in his text. *Cf. it vg*: auriculam. [*Non rell gr nec Ψ Paris*<sup>97</sup>.]

xviii. 15. See under "Order."

17. " " "

22. " " "

29. *τινα κατηγοριαν φερετε* (-κατα) του ανθρωπου τουτου **N**\*B Paris<sup>97</sup> *e et a c q* (*Cf. aeth georg*). This is against all others and *Chr Cyr* and *b f ff g gat vg* (adversus) and *copt syr*.

The common base breaks down here, for CLX so friendly a few verses before, and even WΨ with *φησιν* in this verse, abandon NB to their fate. Only Paris<sup>97</sup> stands by them and *W-H* without a word in their margin. *Soden* abandons them and has no new witness for omission, but he forgets to note *a c*.

36. -αν **B**\*] *Sod*<sup>351</sup> See under "Solecisms of B." *Cf. a b e aur vgg* 1/2. This is quickly followed (against **N**) by a real Latin order:

38. *ουδεμιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω αιτιαν* BLX 213 249 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>1110</sup>  
<sup>1454</sup> **K**ΔΩΝ (*a*) *b c e ff g vg Cyr W-H Sod txt.*

*Cyr* vouches for it as the continuation of an Alexandrian order. It opposes:

*ουδεμιαν αιτιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω* of **NNWΨ al. plur q goth (sah boh) syr arm Chr.**

xix. 7. *κατα τον νομον* (-ημων) **NBD**<sup>mp</sup> LNA *et WΨ Paris*<sup>97</sup> *it [omn praeter q] vgg Orig et Orig*<sup>int</sup> Hil Aug Quaest, but against all the rest, all the minuscules, *Cyr*, and all the other versions. *Soden* places it in square brackets without adducing any new witnesses.

28. > *Ιησους ειδως* **BM**\* *Sod*<sup>1110</sup> **K**. *W-H*<sup>ms</sup> *b e f ff n r aur Hil* (against *ειδως ο Ιησους* **N** and many *W-H*<sup>txt</sup> *Sod*<sup>txt</sup>, and against *Ιδων ο Ιησους* **E** and a good many, and against the order of *syr copt etc.*)

29. *σκενος sine copula* BALXWΨ 61\* Paris<sup>97</sup> *a b e r foss W-H [Sod]*.

38. *Ιωσηφ ό απο Αριμαθαιας* most and *W*, but: *Ιωσηφ απο* (-ό) *Αριμ.* BAD<sup>mp</sup> (L)X?Ψ 90 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>1089\*</sup> and *latin*, against both *coptics diserte*. *W-H* elide ό, *Soden* places it in square brackets.

41. *ην τεθειμενος* (*pro ετεθη*) **NBW** Paris<sup>97</sup> *Cyr Sod*<sup>1279</sup> **K**. *W-H et Sod txt.* (*Sod*<sup>1279</sup> is *Laura*<sup>A 104</sup> which *Lake* did not collate hereabouts). *Cf. lat positus erat. Cf. Luc xxiii. 53.* See under "Harmonistic."

xx. 19. -των (*ante σαββατων*) **NBAIL** 33 *Sod*<sup>1110</sup> *W-H Sod txt.* (*μας σαββατων W*) The rest and *Cyril*<sup>scr</sup> have the article.

John

- xx. 23. *τινος* *bis* (pro *τινων* *bis*) B<sup>ol</sup> a e f syr Cypr Orig<sup>int</sup> Eus Aug Pacian Auct<sup>brum</sup> W-H<sup>ms</sup> [non Sod], but against all else.
- xxi. 6. *ισχυον* (pro *ισχυσαν*) See under "Change of Tense."
22. > *συ μοι ακολουθει* NABC\*DW 1 [non 209] 33 [non *minn* Scr. Matthaei Soden. The latter adds Sod<sup>K</sup> (= Cyr)] latt Orig Cyr. (Om. 235 Chr).
23. > *ουτος ο λογος* NBCDW 1 33 2<sup>pe</sup> it (syr copt) W-H Sod txt. The rest oppose with Chr 1/2 Cyr 1/2; and a few cursives with Chr 1/2 Cyr 1/2 and Origen omit *ουτος*.
24. + *ο* (ante *γραφας*) = *και ο γραφας* BD (Sod<sup>ms</sup> a *και γρ.*) 33 ? b d q r vg<sup>BP</sup> (a) (e) (ff) W-H txt. (N writes ο *και γραφας* with 265 348 Sod<sup>K</sup> Sod txt Cyr and c).

## Coptic Sympathy or Influence.

- i. 14, 15. See under "Solecisms."
18. *μονογενης θεος* NBCL 33 boh [sah ita : "God did not any see ever; God the only son"] syr pesh aeth etc. [non Sod txt].
- 43 *init* (Steph Tisch, ver 42 W-H Sod). *ηγαγεν* sine copula NBL 314 sah W-H Sod txt [contra *rell et syr lat*]. Boh with G fam 1 arm Epiph have *ουτος ηγ.* (ηγ. ουν Eust 15 b, *ηγαγεν δε* Paris<sup>97</sup>)
- ii. 17 *init. Absque copula* NBLT<sup>pX</sup> sah boh (more copt) Eus Cyr 1/2 against all the rest and Epiph Nonn Orig.
- iii. 8. *αλλα ουκ* B<sup>ol</sup> (pro *αλλ' ουκ*) [non W-H] Cf. sah boh, ambo *αλλα*
16. *αλλα εχη* BW soli W-H Cf. sah boh
- iv. 23. *αλλα ερχεται* NBADW sah boh W-H [contra *αλλ' ερχ.* *rell omn*]
- v. 42. *αλλα εγνωκα* BDLW [non 28 male Sod] 33 185 Sod<sup>ires</sup> W-H = sah boh
- iii. 13 *fin. - ο ων εν τω ουρανω* NBLT<sup>uT</sup> et W 33 Sod<sup>180</sup> [non 892 non Paris<sup>97</sup>] sah, boh 1/2, basm (frag Crum-Ken gr et copt) Cyr 1/2 (Orig<sup>int</sup> 1/3) W-H Sod txt, but against all others and it vg syrr (all except one codex of pesh) arm Hipp Dion† Eustath† Amphil Did Epiph Chr Thdt Cyr 1/2 Orig<sup>int</sup> *bis diserte* Novat Hil Lucif Jac<sup>ms</sup>.
- iv. 16. *σου τον ανδρα* B 69 [non fam] 71 74 248 254 490 (Sod<sup>N 11</sup>) Sod<sup>180</sup> Eust 32 60 sah boh Orig 3/6 W-H txt without marginal remark. (*σου τον ανδρα σου* 6<sup>pe</sup>)

† Tisch and Horner omit these witnesses.



against *τον ανδρα σου* of  $\aleph$  and all else including WD 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Orig* 3/6 and *Cyr*.

- iv. 51. — *και ηγγειλαν* BLN 185 213 *Sod*<sup>793</sup> & 460 tam C *boh aeth W-H* and *Sod txt*. That is to say: *λεγοντες pro και ηγγειλαν*, or *pro και ηγγειλαν λεγοντες* which latter the *sah* mss have in full. Now how about *boh* being so youthful, if BL be basic here as *Hort* indicates in his text without marginal alternative, followed by *Soden*? In Dr. Souter's latest book ('Text and Canon' p. 66) he does me the honour to keep silence completely (is this fair criticism?) as to my recent volume on the date of the Bohairic, while reproducing faithfully Guidi's Burkitt's and Leipoldt's obiter dicta. He says: "In the northern part, where was Alexandria, the necessity did not arise till late" [purely gratuitous assumption], "and Guidi, followed by Burkitt and Leipoldt, thinks that the Bohairic version... was made in the sixth or seventh (or eighth) century."

52. *την ωραν εκεινην* (— *παρ αυτων*) only B with the *boh*<sup>cat</sup>  $\aleph$ , another commentary on our remarks as to *boh*. *Sod* adds *Sod*<sup>1434</sup> for omission of *παρ αυτων*, but this codex apparently does not have *εκεινην*, while *Soden* quotes his family  $\aleph$  (= Cyril's Commentary mss) for + *εκεινην* with B, while having *παρ αυτων*. This triple conjunction of B *Sinai* and *Alexandria* is instructive. There is a change of order here as to the position of *παρ αυτων* which throws a further light upon B's course.

54. + *δε* (*post touto init.*) BC\*GT<sup>w</sup>W *min alig boh*<sup>septem</sup> *Orig*<sup>ter</sup> [W-H] *sed Sod txt plene*.

(+ *και init.* = *vel και vel δε aeth*)

Observe *bohairic* again, not *sahidic*, supporting B and *Origen*, with  $\aleph$  absent which goes with the great mass without copula, (+ *ουν* Paris<sup>97</sup> e).

- v. 29. See under "Solecisms." *Sah* supports B for omission of *δε*.

44. — *θεου* (*post μονου*) BW *solī inter gr cum a b μ* (*sol. inter latt*) et *sah et boh* [W-H]. Cf. *etiam Orig Did Eus*. All this seems to come from one error in a MS where ΜΟΝΟΥΘΥΟΥΖΗΤΕΙΤΕ may have misled, rather than that from ΜΟΝΟΥΟΥΖΗΤΕΙΤΕ ΘΥ crept in, for all other Versions as well as Greek documents have *θεου*. (N has *παρα του μονογενοους θεου*.) *Soden* neglects to record *sah boh* for omission.

- vi. 10. *ειπεν sine copula*  $\aleph$ BL 397 *a foss* = *sah et syr cu pesh arm Orig W-H* [non *Sod*], against all the rest which add *δε, και, or ουν*, including the sympathetic minuscules. It is not a question of the "shorter" text which need occupy us here, because in the same verse it is  $\aleph$ BD etc. which add *ουν* after *ανεπεσοι*, while it is EFGHMSVTA which omit.

John

vi. 14. α ἐποίησεν σημεῖα (*pro o επ. σημειων*) BΘ<sup>x</sup>X<sup>b</sup> (= Sod<sup>A4</sup>) a arm *syr hier* and *boh*, against *sah* and the rest. Westcott-Hort adopt in their text this very questionable change.† Simply I suppose because B had the support of another (Egyptian) fragmentary uncial of the sixth century.

42. πως νυν BCTW Sod<sup>280</sup> K<sup>a</sup> BOH goth† *syr hier*  
Ath<sup>cod</sup> W-H Sod *tzt.*

και πως

*syr pesh*

πως ουν

ND *rell latt*<sup>pl</sup> *sah* 4/7 Ath<sup>ed</sup> Chr Cyr,

but *sah* 3/7 *syr cu sin* and Paris<sup>91</sup> v<sup>scr</sup> a e omit νυν or ουν while *aeth* doubles και πως ουν or και πως ουν νυν (as arm *boh*<sup>quatuor</sup>).

*ibid.* — οὗτος *sec.* See under "Improvement."

43. ἀπεκριθη (*sine ουν*) BCKLTΠ *min*<sup>10</sup> et Sod<sup>min</sup> 10 [*sed* *habet ουν* Paris<sup>91</sup>] a e r *sah boh syr arm Cyr W-H* Sod *tzt.*

46. See under "Solecisms."

52. + αὐτου in connection with σαρκα BT<sup>1</sup> 892 Sod<sup>1444</sup> 3 410 (I<sup>8</sup>) [but not other cursives] *it*<sup>pl</sup> *vg sah boh aeth* and *arm syr* with Chr Amm Orig<sup>int</sup> [W-H], but opposed by N and the rest including W ff goth Orig and Cyr.

58. οι πατερες (— υμων) NBCLTW 262 3<sup>ro</sup> BOH Orig W-H  
[Sod] against *sah* and the rest and all the versions.

vii. 3. > σου τα εργα B<sup>sol</sup> vid Cf. *copt.* "[σου] τα εργα " W-H *tzt.*

10. αλλα ως εν BT et *copt* (*rell omn αλλ' εν vel αλλ ως εν*)

49. αλλα ο οχλος BDLTW 33 892 (Sod *teste*) et *copt W-H*  
(*rell omn αλλ' ο οχλος*)

34 *fin.* ου δυνασθε ελθειν + εκει B<sup>sol</sup> *inter gr-lat syr*, but with both *sah* and *boh* (all codices) which add εποq ("to it"). This is a very pretty and decisive place, but Tischendorf misses it completely. Horner exhibits it. Soden neglects it. An addition like this is very deliberate. Either it is right or wrong. Hort condemns it as wrong, for he found no other support. I exhibit it as undoubtedly due to coptic influence on B, thus for ever destroying B as a reliable "neutral" witness elsewhere unless largely supported.

40. + οτι (*ante ουτος*) BDX (*teste Sod*<sup>A3</sup> *contra Tisch*<sup>disert.</sup>) d only  
and *sah boh syr cu (sin)*.

viii. 14. See under "Order."

† Process reversed by the Oxford edition of 1910, to its credit. The plural is relegated to the margin.

† Goth = nu, which then as now in the languages originating from it does not strictly mean *now*, but embraces the meanings of both *ουν* and *νυν*.

viii. 28. + *στι* (*ante otan*) B<sup>soi</sup> et *sah* **ΧΕ** **ΖΟΤΑΠ**, *boh* **ΧΕ** **ΕΓΩΠ**. Tischendorf fails to add coptic here, I suppose because it is the coptic manner (although he sometimes calls attention to this elsewhere) but he thus misses the further link between B and coptic. Horner, copying from Tischendorf's apparatus, refuses here to mention the + *στι* of B, doubtless for the same reason, but I can consider it no accident nor any coincidence, but absolutely deliberate from a bilingual graeco-copt under the hand of B's ancestor. Cf. not only vii. 40 above, but vii. 34 + *εκει*. It has no connection with *syr* here, nor with Latin, nor does it appear in any other Greek (see below again at ix. 11) to date, including WΨ 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> and Laura<sup>A 104</sup>. Soden mentions it without other Greek support. W-H *txt* refuses the addition.

51. *τον εμον λογον* NBCD<sup>97</sup>LT<sup>97</sup>XWΨ 33 213 258 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>123</sup> (*εμον λογον* 892) Orig (Cyr) (Chr) *sah boh*, against the rest, and the Latins (including *d*) and *syr*.

55. *αλλα οιδα* BDN (*contra morem*) XW W-H *txt* (*Reil* *αλλ οιδα*).

ix. 11. + *στι* (*ante υπαγε*) NBLT<sup>1</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup> *sah boh* W-H [*Sod txt*]. Here Horner again fails to introduce this matter into his notes, although Tischendorf *has* observed it, for it rings peculiar in the Greek. W eschews it. It does not appear in D. There is no trace in Latin. The minuscules do not have it, nor Ψ nor 892 Paris<sup>97</sup>. What is it but a reflection of **ΧΕ** **ΒΩΚ** *sah* and **ΧΕ** **ΒΛΑΓΕ** *boh*? Soden on the strength of the additional T<sup>1</sup> (but this fragment is purely Egyptian) and Laura<sup>A 104</sup> introduces *στι* into his text in square brackets. But this place is on all fours with viii. 28 above. If B was wrong there, he is not right here simply because NLT<sup>1</sup> support.

17, 18. See under "Order."

27. B adds *ουν* after *τι* alone of Greeks and Latins in the phrase *τι ουν παλιν θελετε ακουειν*. Most *sah* and *boh* have **ΟΥ ΟΥΝ** = *τι παλιν*, but B could easily misread **ΟΥ ΟΥΝ** = *τι ουν* which one *boh* ms actually has. Aeth and georg are the only other authorities to go with B. (W-H<sup>ms</sup> have it.)

28 *init.* *και ελοιδορησαν* N\*BT<sup>97</sup>W *sah*<sup>91</sup> *aeth syr hier Cyr*, but *οι δε ελοιδ.* DLN<sup>97</sup>Ψ Paris<sup>97</sup>, *ελοιδ. ουν* a few, and the mass and 892 *ελοιδορησαν* without copula.

30. See under "Improvement."

† 31. Once more *αλλα εαν* (*pro αλλ εαν*) BT<sup>97</sup>W *more copt* [not D here] refused by W-H who followed B<sup>soi</sup> at iii. 16.

† Observe Origen alone at x. 18 *αλλα εγω* (**ΑΛΛΑ** **ΑΠΟΚ** *sah boh*).

John

- ix. 36. εφη (pro απεκριθη εκεινος και ειπεν) BT<sup>1</sup>W Cf. sah init. πεχας tantum, and see under "Solecisms of B."
- 40 init. ηκουσαν (sine copula) NBLXX<sup>b</sup>W Sod<sup>1030</sup> 33 157 213 249 Paris<sup>97</sup> sah boh arm Cyr Sod<sup>541 1110</sup> K<sup>1</sup>CN et txt (και ηκουον 892 † και ηκουσαν plur, ηκ. δε D d ff, ηκ. ουν 1 2<sup>re</sup> a).
- x. 4. οταν (sine copula) NBLΠ<sup>2</sup>W Sod<sup>1030</sup> 1 [non fam] 33 157 2<sup>re</sup> Sod<sup>541</sup> K<sup>1</sup>CN sah boh<sup>duo</sup> W-H Sod txt against the rest and the other versions and latt and boh<sup>pl</sup> and sah<sup>unum</sup>.
- 13 init. - ο δε μισθωτος φευγει NBDL 1 22\* 33 397 Sod<sup>K<sup>1</sup> N31</sup> d c syr hier sin arm et sah boh aeth Lucif Orient Symm W-H Sod txt. There is some difficulty here as to the construction without this clause unless we treat the end of verse 12 after φευγει as bracketed. Indeed W goes further and (13) elides ο δε μισθωτος φευγει and the following words οτι μισθωτος εστιν, while fossat writes "mercennarius autem et fugit quia mercennarius est," omitting the rest et non pertinet ad eum de ovidus. Paris<sup>97</sup> begins ο δε μισθωτος, but, eliding φευγει οτι μισθωτος, continues with εστιν. Perhaps NBDL are right.
22. εγενετο τοτε (pro εγενετο δε) BLWΨ 33 Paris<sup>97</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup> sah boh<sup>pl</sup> arm (slav sax goth) W-H Sod against all the rest (gat aeth and some boh conflate with Sod<sup>1110</sup>), and some cursives with a b omit any copula. If we analyse this situation we see in the addition in slav and sax (goth is than which may be δε) the reason why BLWΨ added. ‡
- ibid. χειμων (sine copula) NBDGLXΠW 1 [non fam] 33 42 138 213 2<sup>re</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>1110</sup> ff only and sah boh aeth against all the rest, and against the other versions (b omits the clause).
26. αλλα υμεις (pro αλλ' υμεις) NABLWA 157 c<sup>rec</sup> 2<sup>re</sup> Sod<sup>quintque</sup> (sah boh) W-H.
- (Cf. Orig x. 18 αλλα εγω)
28. > καγω διδωμι αυτοις ζωην αιωνιον (pro καγω ζωην αιωνιον διδ. αυτοις) NBLMXW 33 157 249 397 [non Paris<sup>97</sup>] Sod<sup>120 541</sup> K<sup>1</sup>CN (sah boh) syr arm aeth Cyr W-H, but against all the rest and D and latt and Orig Eus Bas Chr Thdt. For some extraordinary reason Soden (so eclectic is his text) opposes NBLMXW etc. here.
- xi. 12. Out of six varying methods, viz., αυτω οι μαθηται, αυτω οι μαθηται αυτου, αυτω tantum, οι μαθηται tantum, οι μαθηται

† Again the historic imperfect, this time by 892 alone, but all perpetuating the Egyptian preference. See under Matt., Mark and Luke, "Historic present."

‡ But see Dr. Scrivenex's Plain Introduction, 3rd edition, p. 548, where he condemns τοτε for three reasons without reserve. Tischendorf avoids it.

αὐτοῦ of most and textus receptus, BC\*X W-H *Sod txt* choose the sixth expression :

οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῶν with *boh*, against *sah* and ΝDKWΠ b.

- xi. 27. πιστευω (*pro* *ἡπιστευκα*) B\*<sup>sol</sup> with c<sup>act</sup> t<sup>act</sup> *sah* and *boh* (*syr aeth* and *pers*). *Tisch* omits to chronicle any versions. Our own A.V. of 1611 (as *sax*) actually uses the present tense, but Hort refuses to chronicle B even in his margin! [It is not certain that B\* corrected the reading himself.] See the other example of this at x. 25 under "Change of Tense."

28. Following this promptly we find τούτο (for ταῦτα) by ΝBCLWX 59? 213 397 *Sod*<sup>1443</sup> *et txt.*, *aeth boh*<sup>pl</sup> (against *sah*).

44. > λεγει ἰησοῦς αυτοῖς B (*sol inter gr*) *cum sah boh* Orig 1/2, *et L W* Orig 1/2 (*λεγει ο ἰησ. αυτοῖς*) W-H.

I call attention to this here, because it is absolutely the coptic method, not only here where BLW join Origen to perpetuate it (alone of Greeks) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΝΑC, but at xi. 40 just above ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΝΑC λεγει ἰησοῦς αὐτῇ where they do not do it. The adhesion of W has no kind of weight to compel us to adopt the order, for it is simply an Egyptian habit which ΝLW (all thoroughly Egyptian) suffer from in common with Origen. Hort receives it as he receives everything Egyptian, while calling it by another name. (*Om. αυτοῖς* 604 *a r awr* *vg<sup>x</sup> syr sin.*) In this same verse BCL in common with coptic does something else which goes to show more than a common original I think. I refer to the final clause. (See under "Improvement.")

52. ἀλλὰ ἵνα B<sup>sol</sup> (*pro* *ἀλλ ἵνα*) *ut copt*

- xii. 4. λεγει δε (*pro* *λεγει ουν*) ΝBW Paris<sup>97</sup> *boh* only and [W-H]. *Tisch* quotes *goth*, but *goth* "than" stands for δε or ουν, and often for ουν as here where the sense demands a half-way house. *Goth* often shows this and explains—as do other versions in other places—why certain MSS make changes in copulas and otherwise.

Here L *sah* and a few omit the copula; a few Latins have *kai* with *syr*, but the great majority of authorities *ουν*.

12. +ὁ (*ante* *οχλος*) BL *Sod*<sup>1050 178 1043 1121</sup> and *boh* [against *sah*] W-H. I placed this under "Solecisms" first as *Tisch* omits to record the *bohairic*. Cf. *syr sin*.

13. ἐκρανγασαν B\* *sah goth*. See under "Change of Tense."

*ibid.* See under "Improvement."

16. αὐτοῦ οἱ μαθηταὶ ΝB *Sod*<sup>1050</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> *solī et W-H cum copt*.

See remarks under "Coptic and Latin" on this.

34 +οὖν ΝBLXW *min<sup>4</sup> et* 213 *Sod*<sup>1110 1443</sup> *π<sup>31</sup> et*

Johu

- txt.* We need not emphasise this because only *one* sahidic ms joins, but (same verse) :
- ibid.* λέγεις συ (*pro* συ λέγεις) BLXX<sup>b</sup>Π and W Paris<sup>97</sup> W-H & Sod *txt* is *bohairic* order (and *syr*) against the rest and Ν συ λέγεις with the Latins and *sah*.
- xiii. 6. λέγει (*sine copula*) BDL d l m r *sah boh syr hier Orig W-H*
26. βαψω το ψωμιον και δωσω αυτω BC(L) 213 Sod<sup>351 1194 1110 1371</sup> *boh (sah) arm aeth (Orig) W-H* instead of βαψας το ψωμιον επιδωσω of ND *plur.* (W has δωσω ενβαψας το ψωμιον.) Again I have to accuse von Soden's text of conflating and inventing Scripture. He has βαψω το ψωμιον και επιδωσω αυτω. As far as I can see none of the mss which have βαψω (for βαψας) have επιδωσω. Yet Soden appropriates βαψω but follows it with επιδωσω instead of δωσω.
28. τουτο ουδει; (*sine copula*) BWΨ 157 248 485 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>351 1094 1131</sup> *soli cum sah<sup>uno</sup> boh<sup>uno</sup> pers [W-H]* (*contra Origen et rell omn et 892 vid*).
- xiv. 4. See under "Homoioteleuton," and note that *sah* opposes *boh* which concedes the shorter form with NBC\*LQXW 33 157 213 Sod<sup>178 1371</sup> a r.
10. πιστευσεις (*pro* πιστευεις) B\* alone with *boh* (all codices). See under "Change of Tense." Tischendorf quite neglected the *bohairic* support and so does Soden, but Horner calls attention to it. This is followed by a *sahidic* reading (and *both* versions must have been familiar to B).
11. δια τα εργα αυτου (*pro* δια τα εργα αυτα) B 229\* *sah (aeth) W-H<sup>131</sup>* (- αυτα 24\* 157 244 q r *syr arm boh diatess vers Tert; ταυτα* Paris<sup>97</sup>).
15. τηρησετε BLΨ[Sod non Lake] 54 73 Sod<sup>180 351 1061 1110 1278</sup> (= Laura<sup>A 104</sup>)<sup>1349</sup> only, with *sah boh* and *arm* alone of versions and W-H, against τηρησατε of DW and the rest of Greeks and versions. See "Change of Mood."
17. υμεις (-δε) NBQWΨ [Sod non Lake] 346 [non fam] a<sup>100</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>351</sup> a b *Lucif Auct<sup>1000-1</sup>* and *sah<sup>n</sup> boh<sup>alt</sup>* after the Coptic manner, so W-H Sod *txt*, and against all else and versions, the rest of the Latins, and *Did Cyr<sup>Hier</sup>* and *Cyr<sup>Alex</sup>*.
23. ποιησομεθα (*pro* ποιησομεν) See under "Improvement," and note the *sahidic* ΝΔΝ "for us" especially.
- 26/27. +εγω BL 314 *soli et W-H* (εγω ειπον υμιν X 33 127 Sod<sup>K</sup>) either belonging to verse 26 *fin* or verse 27 *init*. See under "Syriac," but possibly attributable to the first word of verse 27 in *sahidic* = †κω for αφημ.
- xvi. 23. >δωσει υμιν εν τω ονοματι μου (*pro* εν τω ονομ. μου δωσει υμιν) NBC\*LXYΔ 397 Sod<sup>1110 K</sup> δ *sah [contra boh]* Orig<sup>131</sup> Cyr 1/2 W-H Sod *txt*. Opposed by the mass and by DWΨ Paris<sup>97</sup> and

the other versions with all the Latins (except  $\delta$  following  $\Delta^m$ ) and Syriacs. The sense of the varying order is quite different: NB *etc.* and *sah* wish to read "And whatsoever ye shall ask the Father, he will give it to you *in my name*," whereas the mass and all the versions (except *sah*) read: "And whatsoever ye shall ask the Father *in my name*, he will give it to you." Of course *Hort* (followed by the Oxford edition of 1910) has no option but to follow NB, supported as they are by CLXYA, but is he right and is *Soden* right? Can we put enough confidence in these mss to follow them against all the rest and against DW with the syriac and latin hosts *in combination*? Apply Burkitt's rule here, then consider all the flimsy alterations NB ask us to adopt in St. John, and our decision will probably come closer to the truth than that of *Hort* or of the Oxford edition or of *Soden*.

- xvi. 29. +*ev* (ante παραρρησια) NB CDW *Sod*<sup>110</sup> *d* and only these Greeks against the other fifteen uncials and all minuscules and *Cyr Chr.* The only support is from *sah*,  $\Sigma\bar{\eta}$  οὐ παραρρησια and *boh*  $\Sigma\bar{\eta}\eta$  οὐ παραρρησια which *Tisch* neglects to mention. Probably the *ev* crept in from the NYN preceding and influenced the common base of NB CDW. The only alternative is that they got it from the Coptic. All the Latins but *d* are against them with *palam* for the *in palam* of *d*. *W-H* and *Sod* have *ev*.

- xvii. 12. [*ev* τῷ ὀνόματι σου]  $\omega$  δέδωκας μοι BC\*LN<sup>o</sup>W 7 33 64 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Cyr*<sup>100</sup> *cum sah boh arm syr hier W-H* [non *Sod*] (*pro* οὐς δέδ. μοι DW *rell omn it vg syr pesh aeth Orig*<sup>100</sup>). *Syr sin* and N<sup>o</sup> omit  $\omega$  or οὐς δέδωκας μοι.

The idea is to conform to the language of verse 11 where  $\omega$  δέδωκας *etc.* of the great majority is doubtless right. We get a variation in verse 12, but these harmonising critical authorities will have none of it, and repeat  $\omega$ . (N writes: *ev* τῷ ὀν. σου > *και* οὐς ἐδωκας μοι ἐφύλαξα).

- xvii. 17. See under "Coptic and Latin," and note + $\eta$  (ante ἀλήθεια) BW Paris<sup>97</sup> *solī cum sah et boh*. *Tischendorf* omits to add *coptic* for this, chronicling B alone for the addition of the article. To B we now add W and Paris<sup>97</sup>, and the Egyptian picture is complete, unless we tabulate the Syriac as emphatic and add it to the small list. *Soden* also neglects *sah boh*. *Hort* does not follow B here as he did not know of the support of *copt* or of W Paris<sup>97</sup>.

- xviii. 3. *και των φαρ.* (—*εκ*) B<sup>201</sup> *cum* 314 [*W-H*] Cf. *sah boh syr* (not mentioned by *Tischendorf*).

34. See under "Order."

- xx. 16. *παββουνει* (*pro* *παββουνι*) BN *solī cum sah*

18. See under "Change of Number."

<sup>John</sup> xxi. 8. *αλλα ως* **NABC** *Sod*<sup>121h</sup> *W-H txt* (*pro αλλ ως*) [*non D hoc loco*]. *Cf. copt.*

11. See under "Improvement."

12. *ουδεις* (*sine copula*) **BC** *sah*† *boh*<sup>unus</sup> [*taur-Tisch non Wordsw*]

18. See under "Order."

*As to the corrector of B.*

As to the corrector of B (*B*<sup>2</sup> or *B*<sup>3</sup>) observe :

xii. 15 where *B*\* has *θυγατηρ* (*pro θυγατερ*) *B*<sup>cor</sup> has inserted *H* = *η* *θυγατηρ* = *sah* and *boh*, but no Greeks. *Von Soden* misses this connection with the Coptic, as did *Tischendorf* before him, but *Horner* has observed it. It should be noted.

*Coptic and Latin sympathy.*

- i. 42. (*Steph. Tisch, ver 41 W-H Sod*). *πρωτον* (*pro πρωτος*) **BAMT<sup>b</sup>XX<sup>b</sup>Π** *Sod*<sup>050</sup> *min aliq copt latt syr W-H Sod txt*. [*Non rell, non LW, non 33 vid, non 892, non Paris*<sup>97</sup>]
43. (*Steph. Tisch, ver 42 W-H Sod*). *ιωαννου* (*pro ιωνα*) **NB\*LW** 33 *a b f ff l r vg*<sup>B<sup>97</sup>E</sup> (*iohanna vgg*<sup>12</sup>) *sah boh* (*aeth*) *Nonn Evang Hebr* (*teste Evan 566 marg*) *W-H Sod txt*, but against all else and *syr Epiph Chr Cyr Serap.* (*ιωαννα Sod*<sup>060</sup>) (*Om dim*).
- ii. 1. *τη τριτη ημερα* (*pro τη ημερα τη τριτη*) **BU** *Sod*<sup>050</sup> *fam 13 127 min<sup>5</sup> Epiph<sup>ter</sup> W-H<sup>ms</sup>* = *b e q r* and *sah*, against *boh* and the great mass of Greeks.
- iii. 18. *ο μη πιστευων* *sec loco* (-δε) **NBW ff l boh**<sup>tres</sup> *Clem Orig Tert Cyp<sup>r</sup>bls W-H* [*non Sod*] but against the mass. This is coptic manner, but most *boh* and all *sah* have δε. The three *boh* MSS involved are FKN. In *Tisch*'s notes neither *boh* nor *Clem* appear for the omission nor in *von Soden*.
- iv. 50. *επιστευσεν* *sine copula* **NBDW** [*non min exc. Sod*<sup>1266 & 371</sup>] *c d l gat vg sah boh*<sup>duo</sup> *Cyr W-H Sod txt* (against *και επιστ.* the rest and *syr boh<sup>l</sup> aeth* and *Paris*<sup>97</sup>, and *επιστ. δε* by *LT<sup>n</sup>* 213 314 *s<sup>scr</sup>* 892).
- v. 12. *ηρωτησαν* (*sine copula*) **NBD** *p<sup>scr</sup> Sod*<sup>237</sup> *a d e ff l r foss sah boh*<sup>alia</sup> and *syr cu arm W-H* [*Sod*]. (*Om vers WΓA b syr sin.*)

† Add this to *Tischendorf*'s apparatus. It is coptic (and coptic style) against all others, but as the others vary among themselves as to what copula to use we need not accuse *B* of dropping anything.



- v. 29. *οι τα φανλα* (*pro οι δε τα φανλα ος και οι τα φανλα*) by B alone of Greeks with *sah* [negl. *Sod*] and *a e ff Tert Aug W-H txt.* (See under "Improvement.") T<sup>1</sup> extant here and otherwise sympathetic has *οι δε τα φανλα*.
- vi. 5. *-τον* (*ante φιλιππον*) **NBDNLΔ** 33 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>541</sup> K. c *Eust* 60 *Cyr W-H Sod txt* (*contra rell omn et W*) = *lat copt.*
7. *-τι* **BD b d e ff l q r aur vg<sup>2</sup> W-H** [*non Sod*] (*cf. copt.*).  
What necessity was there for a "revision" to add *τι* here?
13. } See under "Change of Number."  
22. }
35. *ειπεν* (*sine copula*) **BLTW** 113 Paris<sup>97</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup> *Sod*<sup>178 351</sup>  
*a b e r foss sah boh, arm syr W-H* [*non Sod*].
45. *πας* (*sine copula*) **NBCDLNSTW** *min perpauc it<sup>1</sup> vg sah boh arm aeth syr, sin Orig W-H Sod*, against the rest and *syr cu Cyr.*
- vii. 40. See under "Coptic."
- viii. 14. *>η μαρτυρια μου αληθης εστιν* **BWΔ** 157 235 314 *Sod*<sup>1385</sup>  
*Eust* 60 only of Greeks, with *b vg<sup>2</sup>* only of Latins, and *sah* (against *boh*) *Epiph Did W-H<sup>ms</sup>* (*non txt*) [*non Sod*<sup>131</sup>]. As to Origen he is divided and so is *Chr*, while *D<sup>sr</sup>* has a special form and order peculiar to him. See under "Order."
59. *-διελθων δια μεσου αυτων και παρηγεν ουτως* **NBD** *latt sah syr sin W-H* and *Sod txt.* Even T<sup>1</sup> (extant here) has it. Soden's note to this is a caricature. No one could guess from it that no minuscules omit, not even Paris<sup>97</sup>.
- ix. 4. *ημας...με* **BDT<sup>1</sup>** [*non minn*] *d sah (aeth) syr hier W-H Sod txt*, against  
*εμε . . . . με* by most, all Latins but *d syr* and most versions,  
but *ημας...ημας* **NLW boh arab Cyr** and *Tisch<sup>131</sup>*.
- It will be noticed that W now lends its support to **NL**. See Tischendorf's note on the subject and full evidence in the second part of this book under "Differences between **N** and **B**." The testimony of Origen is not satisfactory enough to draw a conclusion as between **NLW boh** and **BDT<sup>1</sup> sah**.
- ix. 11. *ο ανθρωπος ο λεγομενος* (*pro ανθρωπος λεγ.*) **NBT<sup>1</sup>** 1 33  
Laura<sup>A 104</sup> *sah boh W-H Sod txt* (*ανθρωπος ο λεγομενος Sod*<sup>660</sup>  
Paris<sup>97</sup> *al.*) *et cf. latt.*
24. *εκ δευτερου post του ανθρωπου* **NBD†LT<sup>1</sup>W** 33 Laura<sup>A 104</sup>  
*Sod*<sup>541 1110 1114</sup> [*non Paris*<sup>97</sup>] *b c d † e ff l q sah boh syr pesh W-H*

† *D d* substitute *αυτον* and *συμ* for *του ανθρωπου*, as do only *syr sin* and *arm*, while *pesh* *εργαζον τον ανθρωπον ος ην τυφλον* by expressing "the blind," "caecum," or "non τυφλον."

John

*Sod txt* whereas the rest place the expression after *εφωνησεν ουν* (*Om. gat*).

- ix. 26. — *παλιν* **NBD**[*non T*<sup>1</sup>]*W* 2<sup>ns</sup> *Paris*<sup>97</sup> *a b c d e ff g l r gat aur vg sah boh syr hier* (*mut syr sin*) *Nonn W-H* [*Sod*], against all the rest all other versions and *Cyr*.

35. *εις τον υιον του ανθρωπου* (*pro eis τ. υιον του Θεου*) **NBDW** *Paris*<sup>97</sup> *d sah and syr sin Tisch*<sup>txt</sup> *W-H*<sup>txt</sup> [*non Sod*<sup>txt</sup>] against all the rest including *LT*<sup>1</sup> (with them above) and *Cyr Tert*. I do not enlarge on this miserable change. I have commented upon it in my 'Genesis of the Versions,' pp. 399/400. *Soden* violates what principles he has by opposing **NBDW** here.

- x. 14 *fin. και γνωσκουσι με τα εμα* **NB(D)LW** *it vg sah boh aeth syr hier goth Eus Cyr*<sup>txt</sup> *Nonn W-H* [*non Sod*] (*cf. Epiph et diatess infra*) but *και γνωσκομαι υπο των εμων* *A rell gr omni syr pesh arm Chr Cyr*<sup>com bis</sup> *Thdt.* *Syr sin* conflates both these readings (not indicated by *Soden*).

(*Epiph invertens και γαρ τα εμα προβατα γνωσκει με και γνωσκω τα εμα προβατα. Cf. diatess arab.*)

This is quite a remarkable place. Not a single recorded minuscule [not even *Paris*<sup>97</sup>] agrees with the five uncials: **NBDLW** for the active construction, yet *all* the Latins go with *sah boh* for it. And as *syr sin* amplifies and conflates the two, both must be equally old.

The *diatess* (not inverting) seems to preserve the singular exhibited by *Epiph*: "And I know what is mine, and what is mine knoweth me," continuing as the Greek in a harmonious sentence *καθως γνωσκει με ο πατηρ*.

Again *Soden's* text opposes **NBDLW**. How can he reconcile this action with his attitude elsewhere when he follows **NB** or **BD** alone?

- 19 *init. σχισμα* (*sine copula*) **NBLXW** 33 157 213 249 *Paris*<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>cln</sup> *it* [*non d*] *vg* [*non vg*<sup>DT</sup>] *sah arm W-H Sod txt, contra rell et Chr Cyr, et syr sin* + "And while he was speaking these things."

26. — *καθως ειπον υμιν* **NBKLM\*Π\*** *et W Sod*<sup>950</sup> *min aliq* [*non Paris*<sup>97</sup>] *c g vg* (*et sax*) *gat sah boh arm, W-H Sod txt*, against the rest most Old Latins and *syr sin*.

29. See Burgon 'Causes of Corruption,' Burgon/Miller, p. 24/26.

42. *και πολλοι επιστευσαν* **NBDLX** 1 33 157 213 248 249 *Paris*<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>541 1130 fam UN</sup> *it vg sah boh* (*et syr arm aeth*) *W-H* [*non Sod*] against *και επιστευσαν πολλοι* of *A* and most with *goth* (*arab*). (*πολλοι ουν επιστευσαν W.*)

- xi. 18. *βηθania* (—*η*) Only **NB** *Sod*<sup>1089</sup> with *Lat* and *Copt W-H txt*. Not even *W* agrees.

30. See under "Improvement."

John

† xi. 32. > οὐκ ἀν μου ο ἀδελφός ἀπέθανεν D<sup>sc</sup> (*sah boh*). Cf. οὐκ ἀν μου ἀπέθανεν ο ἀδελφός NBC\*<sup>1060</sup> LΔW Sod<sup>1060 1114 1443</sup> 33 254 δ W-H Sod *txt* against οὐκ ἀν ἀπέθανεν μου ο ἀδελφός AX *gr plur* and οὐκ ἀν ἀπέθανε ο ἀδελφός μου 69 [*non fam*] 397 Sod<sup>1am N</sup> *it vg arm syr*. Yet another variation is: ο ἀδελφός μου οὐκ ἀν ἀπέθανεν by i<sup>sc</sup>. Paris<sup>97</sup> omits μου ("οὐκ ἀν ἀπέθανεν ο ἀδελφός" simply). It may represent the base, and μου have crept in to the varying positions. There is so little serious textual variation in this much challenged chapter that every little thing is interesting.

xii. 16. ταῦτα (*sine copula*) NBLQW<sup>2</sup> Sod<sup>1060</sup> *sah b e ff g l gat vg syr sin W-H Sod txt.*

This I am sure is real coptic (*sahidic*) influence here because NB alone write in this verse αὐτοῦ οἱ μαθηταί placing the possessive first as is the coptic manner, and in *sah* it is very striking, both as to this and as to the absence of copula, for *sah* heads the verse. ΠΕΡΙΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ: "His disciples" proceeding: "knew not these" bringing ταῦτα later, but completely abandoning the copula (except one *sah* ms<sup>115</sup>) and giving great prominence to αὐτοῦ οἱ μαθηταί which NB follow against all others. W omits the copula but does not follow the coptic method here. Do the critics really mean to tell me that I am wrong again and that a common *underlying Greek text* is responsible for αὐτοῦ οἱ μαθηταί in NB and in *sah*? Why then does W not do it? Observe W with NB elsewhere all around this passage.

If anything be wanting to show B's real sympathy of *eye* with the *sahidic* version—(I have shown it previously)—let the critics observe the *order* maintained by B alone two verses beyond at xii. 18.

18. See under "Order."

35. τὸ φῶς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστὶ NBDKLMXII and WΨ *minn<sup>1auc</sup> it vg boh Cyr 1/2 Nonn W-H Sod txt*, but τὸ φῶς μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐστὶ A the rest and *sah syr arm aeth Chr Cyr 1/2*.

xiii. 11. + ὅτι (*ante οὐχι πάντες καθαροὶ ἐστέ*) BCLW 33 213 397 Sod<sup>183 190 541 1110 EΛN 31</sup> *a b c f ff l q r sah boh syr Cyr W-H [Sod]*, but against N and the rest, *e* and Orig. (Paris<sup>97</sup> repeats ἀλλ in this place from the previous verse; but *syr*

† In Tischendorf's apparatus change D to D<sup>sc</sup> (*d* reads *frater meus*) and add δ after 254, for δ actually reads *meus* over μου thus:

$\bar{n}$      $\bar{e}$ ffer     $\bar{m}$ i        $\bar{m}$ ortuul        $\bar{f}$ rat  
 ΟΥΚ   ΑΝ   ΜΟΥ · ΑΠΕΘΑΝΕΝ · Ο · ΑΔΕΛΦΟΣ

John

*sin* otherwise, for *δια τουτο* etc: "Because of him said he this word.")

- xiii. 30/31. *στε ουν εξηλθεν* **NB**CDLXW *minn non pauc.*, *latt copt Orig*, *W-H Sod txt*, but *ουν* is against *syr* and the rest of the Greeks.
- xiv. 5. *κυριε ουκ οιδαμεν που υπαγεις, πως (-και)...* **BCLW** *sah boh<sup>duo</sup> aeth* and *arab* with *a b r* and *syr sin W-H* [*non Sod*]. I do not definitely accuse this of not being basic (although *Tertullian* is against it), yet the changes by the various authorities in the form of the sentence following, where **Σ** and **B** are divided once more, shows ancient editing at this place, and the absence of copula may be due only to Egyptian influence. Yet *a b r* and *syr sin* are of weight, although *d* and the rest oppose. *Arab* continues the Egyptian traditions for omission. Observe in xiv. 7 soon following, another suppression of *και* before the *απαρτι* clause by a **B** group, this time followed by *Soden* as well as by *W-H*, against **Σ** and the majority, and furthermore at:—
9. A second suppression of *και* before *πως* by **NBQW** 58 Paris<sup>97</sup>, this time with *a b c e ff g foss vg Iren<sup>int</sup> Hil* and *boh<sup>omn</sup>* [*not sah* this time nor *syr sin*] *W-H* [*non Sod*] while *aeth* here with *pers* and *Cyr* have *πως ουν*. Observe **D** and *d* are still absent, as at xiv. 5, and it is fair criticism that instead of "Antioch" revising by adding *και* in both places, **D et al.** preserve the "true text" with it, since the authorities which omit in the one and in the other places are not agreed among themselves, or rather disagree completely and it is in the Egyptian manner to omit.
14. *τουτο ποιησω (pro εγω ποιησω)* Only **BALA<sup>2</sup>Ψ** *Sod<sup>13</sup> 33 124* [*non fam*] 249 262 397 *Laura<sup>A</sup> 101 Sod<sup>1110</sup> 1131 1443 fam N Eust 16* *c g q r gat vg Aug boh sah aeth (+υμιν) Cyr W-H<sup>txt</sup>* [*non Sod*]. Add *sah* to Tischendorf's and *Soden*'s apparatus for this. (**M\*** reads *εγω τουτο*). It is opposed by the great mass of good authorities and looks very non-neutral. In fact the 14th verse is entirely omitted by some authorities including *syr sin* and *syr hier* and most *codd* of *arm*, and *Chr*, and *b* and *vg<sup>F</sup>*.
- xv. 26. *οταν sine copula* **NBA** 2<sup>pe</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> *e l m δ vg<sup>Q</sup> sah<sup>tres</sup> boh<sup>pl</sup> syr hier pers arab sax Did Chr Epiph Novat Hil W-H* [*non Sod*], but against all others and *Cyr*.
- xvi. 16. —*οτι εγω υπαγω προς τον πατερα* **NBDLW** 314 *Laura<sup>A</sup> 104 Sod<sup>1110</sup> a b d e ff r sah boh<sup>pl</sup> aeth Orig W-H* and *Sod txt* (against all the rest and *syr* including *sin*, and **Ψ** and Paris<sup>97</sup>).
19. *εγω sine copula* **NBDLW** 1 [*non fam*] 33 348 2<sup>pe</sup> *Sod<sup>183</sup> 1043* *a b d e r awr boh<sup>pl</sup> sah arm pers georg (Orig) W-H Sod txt*.

John

- xvi. 23. — *οτι* BCD\*<sup>am</sup> LNY 42 *Sod*<sup>am</sup> K. C [non WΨ Paris<sup>97</sup>] *b d e f ff g q gat vg* [contra *a c r δ*] *Orig Ath Cyr*<sup>10</sup> *Quacst*, and *boh* (which version *Tisch* and *Soden* neglect†) *W-H Sod txt*, against *ℵ* and the rest.
25. *ερχεται* (— *αλλα*) *ℵBC*\*D\*LXYΠ<sup>2</sup> and W 1 [non fam] 33 69 [non fam] 213 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>183 1110</sup> *a b d e g gat vg* (*hinc sax*) *sah arm syr hier Orig*<sup>int</sup> *Aug W-H Sod txt*, but against the rest and *Orig Ath Cyr*.
- xvii. 4. *τελειωσας* (*pro ετελειωσα*) *ℵABCLNII et W* 1 [non fam] 33 42 122 246 Paris<sup>97</sup> *w*<sup>ex</sup> *b ff Hil 1/2 sah boh aeth Cyr 1/2 W-H Sod txt*, against the rest, whose testimony is strong, including that of *Ign.* [*τετελειωκα Sod*<sup>216</sup> *ut lat.*]
7. *εισιν* (*pro εστιν*) See under "Change of Number."
17. This is a peculiar and interesting place.  
*"αγιασον αυτους εν τη αληθεια"* without *σου* is read by *ℵ(B)AC*\*DLΠ<sup>2</sup> and W 1 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>170</sup> (*Cyr*<sup>txt</sup>) and the *Latins* and *sah boh W-H* [non *Sod*], but all the other versions have *σου*. The interesting point is that B alone [not *sah boh*] drops *τη* before *αληθεια*, reading like the *Latins* "in veritate." We narrow the matter of the versions here down to *Latin* and *Coptic*, and since in the same verse B adds *η* before *αληθεια* subsequently with W Paris<sup>97</sup> only of *Greeks* but both *sah boh* † we are clearly on *Latin* and *Coptic* ground and in connection with *both*. Observe *Soden's* critical principles or eclecticism here. He holds *σου* in verse 17 while rejecting *ετελειωσα* above in verse 4 both witnessed to by the same group.
21. *ινα και αυτοι εν ημιν* (— *εν*) *ωσιν BC*\*DW *a b c d e r vg*<sup>e</sup> *sah arm W-H* [non *Sod*] against the mass. The few Fathers who quote without *εν* are also found to have it elsewhere, and *Clem* has it, which should be decisive as against D. *Syr sin* is illegible just at this place. Perhaps the vulgate *ms E* gives us the key. It writes *ut ipsi in nobis in (unum...)* reduplicating the *εν*. Possibly *ENHMINENΩCIN* in the uncial writing caused the withdrawal of *EN* (*εν*) after *ημιν*. Both Ψ and Paris<sup>97</sup> retain *εν* with *ℵ* and the mass.
24. This place does not really belong under the present heading. I do not know exactly where to put it. It refers to a very difficult matter. I will cite the verse in full:  
*πατερ (πατηρ BAN; om. et subleg. και syr sin) ος δεδωκας μοι θελω ινα οπου ειμι εγω κακεινοι ωσιν μετ εμου ινα θεωρωσιν την*

† But in view of Coptic methods should be noticed here.

† And perhaps the emphatic Syriac.

John

δοξαν την εμην, ἣν δεδοκας (αλ. εδωκας) μοι οτι ηγαπησας με προ καταβολης κοσμου.

*Clem.*, quoting 24/26, does not vary (except as to the tense of "gavest") and employs οὗς. So do the other Fathers: *Eus Chr Cyr Cypr Thdt etc.*, but **NBDW** Paris<sup>97</sup> *boh* [*non sah*] *goth* and *d* (agreeing with D<sup>85</sup>) and *syr sin W-H* and *Sod txt* substitute δ for οὗς. The only key to an error in writing would occur if πατηρ were absent between the two verses, as is the case in *syr sin* alone, and where ηγαπησας would be followed by ους: ΗΓΑΠΗΣΑΚΟΥΣ, but this cause of corruption is very unlikely. Clearly here **NBDW d boh goth syr sin** hold the more difficult (most difficult) reading. Hort adopts it, but has nothing in his 'Notes on Select Readings' about it. The Oxford edition of 1910 places οὗς in the margin and Souter gives the evidence in a footnote. *Soden* boldly adopts δ (although *Sod*<sup>760</sup> reads ου [showing an original difficulty, but not δ]) notwithstanding the fact that the omission which he neglected in verse 21 just above was sustained by a rather stronger family group.

To what δ refers is difficult to conjecture, and I would only remark as to the relative age of *boh* and *sah* that it is *boh* which goes with the accepted minority here for the hard reading and not *sah*. Surely if *boh* belonged to the vi<sup>th</sup> or vii<sup>th</sup> century this δ would have been smoothed to οὗς by then. My excuse for inserting this matter here, on the authority only of *d* and *boh* of the *Latt* and *Coptt*, is that it calls attention to this matter of date.

- xviii. 15. ηκολουθει δε τω Ιησου Σιμων Πετρος και (-ο) αλλος μαθητης. Thus: ἄλλος without the article **N\*ABD<sup>sup</sup>WΨ** 106 c<sup>scpt</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> 8<sup>pe</sup> *Sod*<sup>178 1222</sup> [*non Paris*<sup>97</sup>] with *sah boh* (ΚΕΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ) *it vg* (alius) and *Nonnus* specifically "και νεος αλλος εταιρος," but the article is found in **CN<sup>cb</sup>** fourteen other uncials *Chr* and *Cyr*, and rather specifically in *syr* "et unus ex discipulis aliis." *W-H* and *Sod* suppress the article.

*ibid.* > γνωστος ην (*pro ην γνωστος*) **BW** 4 *Paris*<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>δ 469</sup> *it*<sup>pl</sup> *boh* (*sah*) and *syr W-H<sup>ms</sup>*.

31. πειλατος (-ο) **BC\*** *Sod*<sup>δ 362</sup> *solī vid et W-H*. Cf. *latt boh*.  
*ibid.* -ουν sec. **BC** 225 250 *sah*<sup>pl</sup> *boh e q vg<sup>GR</sup> syr pesh sin arm W-H*.

- xix. 12. ο πειλατος ante εξητει **NBLMXWΨ** *fam* 13 33 249 *Paris*<sup>97</sup> *Laura*<sup>A 104</sup> *Sod*<sup>δ 541 1110 1089</sup> [male 1390] **Κ: CN** *it*<sup>pl</sup> *sah boh Cyr W-H Sod txt*, against two other varieties of order, while *b* omits Pilate outright.

16. παρελαβον ουν τον Ιησουν tantum sine addit. **B(L)X** (19) 33 (42) (61\*) 249 *a b c e ff n r aur boh Cyr W-H Sod txt*.

There are a host of varieties here, chiefly of amplification. Of the versions, outside of the Old Latins named, all add something except *boh*. Even *sah* has "But they when they had taken Jesus, they brought him out." In such cases, when the critics follow B and so few witnesses, I wish to call particular attention to the fact that *boh* agrees and not *sah*. In such passages then *boh* has not been smoothed and added to as they would have us believe.

John

- xix. 20. > εβραιστι ρωμαιστι ελληνιστι BLNXΨ et Ν\* (*hiat* Ν\* *ex hom.*) 33 74 89 90 234 248 q<sup>scr</sup> r<sup>scr</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>351 1110 1089 1362</sup> K. N<sup>31</sup> e ff *sah* et *boh* arm aeth georg syr hier Cyr W-H Sod txt [*contra tell pl.*: εβρ. ελλ. ρωμ.]

24. -η λεγουσα NB 249 a b c e ff r georg *sah*<sup>pl</sup> [*non omn*] Ps-Ath W-H.

No others omit, not even WΨ or Paris<sup>97</sup>, but *cf. pers* probably representing *syr sin* still missing. *Pers* says "and the Scripture was fulfilled," whereas *syr pesh* says "and the Scripture was fulfilled *which said*" (for the usual *ινα η γραφη πληρωθη η λεγουσα*). The omission by NB *sah*<sup>pl</sup> is against *Cyril* although made their own by W-H, and *Soden* encloses the words in square brackets. Why then oppose as he does the larger group at xviii. 21 above?

John

- xx. 6. See under "Improvement."

- xxi. 20. επιστραφεις (-copula) BACΠ\*W 33 265 w<sup>scr</sup> Sod<sup>1089</sup> b c e g r gat vgg<sup>pl</sup> *sah* arm *pers* georg. (Simon turned round and saw *syr sin*). The rest have δε or και, and *Chr ovv*. W-H and Sod txt omit the copula.

21. τουτον + ουν. See under "Improvement."

### Traces of Syriac Sympathy.

John

- iii. 25. B alone adds των after μαθητων, reading εκ των μαθητων των Ιωαννου. This may be reduplication, but *cf syr sin* and *syr pesh*: "of one of the disciples of John."

28. It is a little curious that so soon after this B alone with *syr hier* adds εγω after ειπον so [W-H], while T<sup>b</sup> and *syr cu sin* prefix εγω, but the other Greeks all eschew this.

Again :

34. -το πνευμα B\*<sup>sol</sup> (h<sup>scr</sup> \*?) might be omitted also in *syr sin*.

- iv. 11. -η γυνη B<sup>sol</sup> cum *syr sin* et W-H txt (εκεινη pro η γυνη Ν).

Westcott and Hort here followed B alone. This is now found supported by *syr sin*, while Ν substitutes *εκεινη*. Cf. the cursive 28 (sister ms to W) and *dimma* at John xx. 15, *εκεινος pro ο Ιησους* also with

*syr sin* alone. *Von Soden* does not mention this at all in his notes, although I called attention to it specifically in the Appendix, vol. ii., of my 'Genesis of the Versions,' pp. 100 and 171, and *Scholz* had duly reported 28 for *εκείνος*.

The scientific course would be to follow *syr sin* in both places. Of course *Hort* did not dream of following *Evan.* 28 at xx. 15. But this situation reveals the insecurity of a text founded on preconceived ideas. If *syr sin* be right in iv. 11 why not at xx. 15? The answer is because B is the key. Anything which supports B is greedily availed of, as will be a few readings of the new *ms* W. But let *syr sin* or W oppose B, however much other support they may have, and the Hortites tumble over themselves to get away from such readings.

*ἐκεῖνος* is a word however of peculiar importance in St. John, and these passages are well worthy of thought. See John ii. 21, iv. 25 for its general use, and xvi. 13/14 *de spiritu veritatis*.

Dr. Abbott does not go into this matter very fully in his *Johannine Grammar* (but see § 2381, 2, 2731, 2), and as the Concordances do not subdivide the subjects, I append a list of the diverse applications of *εκείνος*, *εκείνοι*, and *εκείνη* in St. John's Gospel. The word is used specifically :

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Of God  | at vi. 29  |
| Of the Father                                 | i. 33, v. 19 38, vii. 29, viii. 42   |
| Of the Son                                    | i. 18, ii. 21  |
| Declaration of the Son of God                 | ix. 37 <i>εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἑώρακας αὐτὸν καὶ ὁ λαλῶν μετὰ σου ἐκεῖνος ἐστίν.</i>  |
| Of the announced Christ                       | iii. 28 30 (testimony of the Baptist),<br>iv. 25 (testimony of the Samaritan woman).   |
| Of the Light of Heaven                        | i. 8 ( <i>cf.</i> v. 35)   |
| Of the Holy Spirit                            | xiv. 26, xvi. 8 13 14  |
| Of the Word                                   | xii. 48  |
| Of the Scriptures                             | v. 39  |
| Of the believer                               | xiv. 12 21, xvii. 24. Also vi. 57 (of the communicant)   |
| Of the angels                                 | at the tomb xx. 13   |
| Of the Healer (in the mouth of the paralytic) | v. 11 <i>ὁ ποιήσας με υγιῇ ἐκεῖνος μοι εἶπεν...</i>  |
| As well as of Jesus                           | in the mouth of the Jews. vii. 11 <i>οἱ οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ εορτῇ καὶ ἐλέγον πού ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος; again ix. 12 πού ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος; again ix. 28 σὺ εἰ μαθητὴς ἐκείνου; and again xix. 21 ἐλέγον οὖν τῷ πῖλῳ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων μὴ γράφῃ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐκεῖνος εἶπε βασιλεὺς εἰμι τῶν Ἰουδαίων.</i> |
| Of the year of Christ's death                 | (τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου) xi. 49, xviii. 13   |
| Also of John Baptist                          | v. 35 ( <i>cf.</i> i. 8)   |



Of <i>John the writer</i>	xix. 35
Of the <i>beloved apostle</i>	xiii. 25, xxi. 7 23
Of <i>Moses</i>	v. 46 47
Of the <i>disciple</i> known to the High priest	xviii. 15
Of <i>Peter the denier</i>	xviii. 17 25 (at xiii. 6 NB b Orig Cyr omit <i>εκεινος</i> )
Of the <i>disciples</i>	xi. 13
Of <i>Mary</i> , sister of Martha	xi. 29
Of <i>Mary Magdalene</i>	xx. 15 16
Of the <i>scribes and pharisees</i>	vii. 45
Of the <i>blind man</i>	ix. 9 11 25 36
Of the <i>sheep</i>	x. 16
Of the <i>false shepherd</i>	x. 1
Of another teacher coming in his own name	v. 43
Of <i>Judas</i>	xiii. 26 27 30
Of <i>Satan</i>	viii. 44
Of the <i>Jews</i>	x. 6 35 (add xix. 15 by BLXN <sup>c</sup> )

Laura<sup>A 104</sup> Sod<sup>1110</sup> K<sup>1</sup> C b e q Cyr W-H Sod txt †)

It is even found in the *pericope de adult.* at viii. 10 *ανακυφας δε ο Ιησους και μηδενα θεασαμενος πλην της γυναικος ειπεν αυτη* “Η γυνη που εισιν *εκεινοι* οι κατηγοροι σου, ουδεις σε κατεκρινεν;”

Add xx. 15 of him whom Mary supposed to be the gardener (testimony of 28 and *syr sin*), and iv. 11 of the woman of Samaria (testimony of N).

### Traces of Syriac (continued).

John

- vi. 71. *εις των δωδεκα (-ων)* BC\*DL 230 Sod<sup>337 351 551</sup> d aeth [against *sah boh*] and *syr* only W-H [non Sod txt] (*δν pro ών* 604).
- vii. 34. +με See under “Improvement.”
- viii. 39. *εστε...ποιετε* B ff vg (Orig) *pro ητε...εποιετε.* W-H txt [Sod *εστε...εποιετε αυ*] † (Cf. *syr sin*).
- xi. 2. *μαριαμ* B 33 *syr W-H* (Copt latin and the rest *μαρια*)
- § 19. *μαριαμ* again BCDLΔ *syr W-H*, here, in another case “*προς Μαρθαν και Μαριαμ*” instead of *Μαριαν* as N and most.

† Soden should not include 88 for this.

‡ Soden's notes are so constructed here as to be very obscure. The reading of B *ποιετε* being relegated to the third series of notes with 188 (my 604) which latter however has *av* which is missing in B, and has *ητε* against *εστε*. The connection between these matters is lost in Soden's apparatus as often elsewhere.

§ Soden quotes “lat” for this accusative but neglects to speak of *syr* here, or above, or below.

John

- ( xi. 20. But here only 33 138 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>7050</sup> and 2<sup>re</sup> ? are recorded for *Μαριαμ*.)

The above should be noted as to a kind of indirect *Syriac* influence on B, for at:—

21. B (possibly C) and *syr sin* ALONE omit *κρυπτε* of all known MSS and versions except *Evst* 54, not quoted by *Tisch* or *Horner* or *Soden*; and the omission in *Sod* edition, relegated to his bottom notes as if of no importance! Has *Soden* not read *Merx* on this (p. 273 of the *Schlussband*) ?
- ( 28. B holds *μαριαμ* here but with D and ACKLΔΠ Sod<sup>7050</sup> 33 138 157 Paris<sup>97</sup>, while *Σ* maintains *μαριαν*; the same applies to xi. 31. )
32. *μαριαμ*, nominative, BC\*E\*L 33 157 Paris<sup>97</sup> *syr* (*μαρια* *Σ* *rell*)
- xii. 3. *μαριαμ* „ B 1 [*non fam*] 33 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>N 31</sup> *syr* (*μαρια* *Σ* *rell*)

See below at xx. 16.

46. —πας B<sup>2</sup> alone with *syr sin*. Perhaps an error or deliberate harmonising with verse 44. Relegated to *Soden*'s bottom notes, where he omits *syr sin* (cf. *Merx*, p. 335).
- ( xiii. 22. εβλεπον *sine copula* BC 16 245 Sod<sup>1349</sup> *e arm pers* (*Orig*) sah<sup>unus</sup> et *Σ* W-H.

I venture to place this here, although the *syriacs* have a copula, since *pers* and *arm* are agreed to support BC, and possibly the old *syriac* underlying *pers* and *arm* was without it, and BC may represent the base here. The more so as in verse 25 ουν or δε omitted by BC 138 *e Orig* only, is also wanting in *syr sin*. *Soden* quotes Ψ for omission, but *Lake* does not record it.)

- xiv. 5. See under "Coptic and Latin."

26/27. This is a place of some importance, although involving the addition merely of the little personal pronoun *εγω*. *Tischendorf* says: "*υμιν...Praeterea* BL 127 add *εγω* (*sive ad υμιν sive ad seqq trahitur*," by which he means that we can read either at the end of verse 26 παντα α ειπον υμιν *εγω*, or παντα α ειπον υμιν, and place the *εγω* at the head of verse 27: "*εγω ειρηνην αφιημι υμιν*."

As a matter of fact *Evan* 127, correctly reported by *Birch*, is misreported by *Scholz* and *Tischendorf*, for 127 reads in verse 26 παντα α *εγω ειπον υμιν* as X 33 Sod<sup>K</sup> and not παντα α ειπον υμιν *εγω* as BL 314 (= Sod<sup>C13</sup>), so that while 127 definitely places *εγω* in verse 26, BL are indeterminate as to adding it at end of verse 26 or at beginning of verse 27. No other *Greeks* or *Latins* add in either place! *Hort* however crams it in after υμιν verse 26 *fin* [*R.V.* does not, again opposing *Hort*]. Neither of the *coptic* versions has *εγω* in

either verse, but the first word in *sahidic* of verse 27 is **†κω** (= *αφιημι*) which might mislead the eye. In *aeth* however *εγω* is present in the same position as in BL. The situation in *syriac* is as follows:

*Syr<sup>pesh</sup>* says 26/27 *παντα α ειπον εγω υμιν ειρηνην αφιημι εγω υμιν*. *Syr<sup>hier</sup>* (lesson 150) has *εγω* in verse 27 but not in verse 26. *Syr<sup>sin</sup>* has *εγω* verse 26 *fin* without *υμιν* (as *Cyr* only but *α β c e ff l m r aur* omit *υμιν*), and *syr<sup>cu</sup>* apparently has *υμιν* without *εγω* (separately) but *εγω* separately verse 27 after *αφιημι* (Lewis ed. p. 254 note "Dissimilia" line 4, and photograph opp. 1st col. line 4). At any rate the *εγω* of BL seems clearly due to the influence of a *version*. Tischendorf says nothing of the *Syriac*.

[*W<sup>sc</sup>* is wanting from xiv. 25 to xvi. 7 and 892 ceases on parchment at xiv. 23.]

- xix. 10. Matter of order and quite important. As to Pilate's speech to our Lord. Instead of *ουκ οιδας οτι εξουσιαν εχω σταυρωσαι σε και εξ. εχω απολυσαι σε*, the order is reversed to: *απολυσαι σε...σταυρωσαι σε* by *NBAE\*N Sod<sup>co</sup> e* and *syr<sup>pesh</sup>* [*hiat sin*] only, but with *pers* (doubtless representing the missing *syr sin* [*Tisch* forgets *pers*]) and *arab W-H* [against both *coptics*].

*WΨ* all *minn.* including *Paris<sup>97</sup>* give us the usual order which *Soden* follows.

11. In this connection observe the order *δεδομενον σοι* here of *NBD<sup>sup</sup>LY* and *W Sod<sup>1121</sup> K<sup>i</sup>* with *syr* and *it<sup>pl</sup> Cyr Iren<sup>int</sup> Orig<sup>int</sup> 1/2 W-H Sod txt*, against *σοι δεδομενον* of most and *Cyr*. The order in the previous clause *κατ εμου ουδεμιαν* of *NBD<sup>sup</sup>KLXWΨ 1 33 124 [non fam] 138 157 2<sup>pe</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup> W-H Sod txt* is also *Latin* order. Observe also the *ο παραδους* in this verse of *NBEΔΛ Sod<sup>1050 1089 min<sup>allq</sup> et W-H [non Sod txt]</sup>* (for *ο παραδιδους*) = *it vg syr*: *qui tradidit*.

- †xx. 16. *μαριαμ (pro μαρια)* *B* with *NLNOH* and *W 1 33 71<sup>marg</sup> W<sup>sc</sup> Sod<sup>1121 1222</sup> sah boh syr Greg Nyss Sev (Nonn) Tisch<sup>txt</sup> W-H<sup>txt</sup> [non Sod]*.

(See above at xi. 2, 19, 28, 32, xii. 3).

This is quite noteworthy. It occurs in our Lord's single-worded address to the woman—(and is the correct lingual antithesis as it were to the answer "*παββουι!*" introduced in *NB* and the majority by *εβραιστι* but not by all);—whereas

† *Paris<sup>97</sup>* breaks off at xx. 15, the last leaves having apparently perished, as have the last leaves of the Apoc. in some mss, and as those or that of St. Mark where that Gospel came last.

John

*sah boh* do not use *μαριαμ* but *μαρια* earlier in the chapter, as do the rest. *Σ* however has *μαριαμ* throughout.

xx. 18. *μαριαμ* again BNL 1 33 2<sup>o</sup> [*Sod teste*] *sah* [*non boh*] *syr Nonn*

23. *τινος bis pro τωνων bis* B (*sol inter gr*) *a e f r syr Cypr Orig<sup>int</sup> Eus.*

## "Form."

John

i. 12. *ελαβαν* B [*non W-H*]

{ v. 39. *εραυνατε* *ΣBN Sod<sup>C60</sup>* (*pro ερευνατε*)  
vii. 52. *εραυνησον* *ΣB\*T* [*non N*] (*pro ερευνησον*) } *et W-H*

The word occurs nowhere else in the Gospels. But at 1 Pet. i. 10 *εξηραυνησαν* by *ΣAB\** while in the very next verse 11 *εραυνωντες* follows by *ΣB\** but not by A.

At 1 Cor. ii. 10 *εραυνα* by *ΣAB\** and C, but at Rom. viii. 27 only *Σ* has *εραυνων* against B and the rest *ερευνων*. Finally at Apoc. ii. 23 *εραυνων* is found in AC (*hiat* B) but *ερευνων* here by *Σ* and the rest.

vi. 22. *περα (pro περαν)* B<sup>\*601</sup> Cf *Liddell and Scott* [*non W-H*]

*Soden* does not care to record this in his foot-notes, so B remains alone. But it is an indubitable "improvement."

42. *ουχι ουτος (pro ουχ ουτος)* BT *et W-H*

43. *μετα αλληλων (pro μετ' αλλ.)* B 157 *sol* [*non W-H*]

*Soden* did not recollate St. John in 157 so does not record it; but he adds *Sod<sup>650</sup> Sod<sup>371</sup>* (presumably ε371 = *Evan* 4 at Paris) and Ψ although not reported by Lake.

viii. 12. *μοι (pro εμοι)* BT *Orig* (Until BT were carefully collated *Orig* was always cited alone for this. No others seem to join, nor 892 nor Paris<sup>97</sup> more recently collated). *W-H* place *μοι* in text and do not consider *εμοι* at all. *Soden* retains *εμοι* and has no new evidence for *μοι*.

† 55. *καν (pro και εαν)* *ΣBDW Sod<sup>341</sup>* *sol* *et W-H* (cf. viii. 14 *ubi καν habent MSS<sup>omn</sup>* *et sah boh, sed Orig c<sup>scr</sup> και, cf. viii. 16 καν Σ solus*)

57. *εωρακες* B\* *et W Sod<sup>650</sup>* (*pro εωρακας*) [*non W-H*]

x. 24. *εκκυλευσαν* B

xi. 24. *εν τη αναστασει* B (*pro εν τη αναστασει*) [*negl. Sod*]

28. *ειπασα (pro ειπουσα secund.)* BC

† By using *καν* for *και εαν* at viii. 16 *Σ* (alone) shows that this is a "preference." The others do not have it there. Are they right at viii. 55? Observe that *Clem<sup>100</sup>* uses *καν* elsewhere.

Actually in *W-H* text because *C* supports. No marginal alternative. The Oxford text of 1910 restores *ειπουσα*. I presume *ειπασα* is a "form" and not a change of tense, but unless *B* intended a subtle variation between the first and second *ειπουσα* in the verse, it is difficult to see why he writes thus. Compare the versions. *Latin* and *sah* make the first *ειπουσα* = a past participle, and the second a present participle. (*ειπων sec. loco* by the critical codex 213 (= *Sod*<sup>129</sup>) so often in the *B* group elsewhere.) *Boh*, according to Horner, conveys a past participle in the second place.

In order to avoid burdening the apparatus in Part II. with a lot of minor differences in form or spelling,† I have not chronicled a host of places where *N* or *B* write *ειπαν* for *ειπον*.‡ I wish I had done so however, as this case arises which might seem at first sight to require delicate treatment. But it will be seen, as neither *N* nor *B* are constant in the use of *ειπαν*, that it is merely a matter of occasional preference with either of them (indeed *D* writes *ελεγον* and *ελεγαν* in the same verse, John ix. 16) and that *ειπασα secund.* in xi. 28 is not to be regarded seriously. Some cursive mss place a stop after *αυτης* and before *λαθρα ειπουσα*, but I do not think *B* was finessing here. Hort ('Notes on Orthography,' vol. ii., p. 164, col. ii. top) says: "The participles *ειπας, ειπασα* are rare: the forms in *-αντος, -αντες, -αντα* have no sufficient authority anywhere." It is regrettable that he did not refer to this place at John xi. 28 where *ειπούσα* is first used and then *ειπασα*, by himself and *BC* only. He admits that *ειπαντος* and cases other than the nominative are not recognisable in the *N. T.* Then why admit *ειπασα* in xi. 28? Why not have used *ειπας* at ix. 6 where the discourse had preceded the act of healing? Cf. some mss in note below at xi. 38.

John

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| xi. 37. <i>ανξας</i>   | <i>B*D</i> [non <i>W-H</i> ]   |
| § 38. <i>ενβριμωμενος</i>  | <i>B*D</i> (Cf. xv. 18 <i>μεμεισηκεν BIX</i> )                             |
| xii. 15. <i>Σειων (pro Σιων)</i>   | <i>B*A</i> [non <i>W-H</i> ]   |
| 32. <i>αν (pro εαν)</i>  | <i>B</i> 13 [non <i>fam</i> ] <i>W-H</i> . Here 157                        |
|  | <i>Sod</i> <sup>1371</sup> <i>Orig Ath Bas Chr Caes</i> have <i>οταν</i> . |
| (xiv. 13. <i>αιτητε pro αιτησητε</i>   | <i>BQ</i> only and <i>W-H</i> <sup>ms</sup> . It may be                    |
| ellipsis or "Change of Tense."   | See thereunder and also as   |
| to the same form at xv. 16 by <i>BLΨ</i> . There <i>Sod</i> does not                   |  |
| even record <i>αιτητε</i> although he did at xiv. 13. <i>Sod</i> <sup>1385</sup> alone |  |
| improvises <i>αιτησησθε</i> at xiv. 13.)   |  |

† Thus sometimes *B* spells *παρησια* with one *ρ*, sometimes it is *N* who does this.

‡ Thus taking for example John ix. we find ix. 22 26 *ειπαν* by *N* alone, ix. 28 40 *ειπαν ND*, ix. 20 *ειπαν NBL* [not *D*], ix. 12 28 24 34 *ειπαν MBD*.

§ *εμβριμωμενος NAU al. aliq; εμβριμωμενος plur; sed ενβριμων W; εμβριμη-σμενος C\*X 213 Sod*<sup>1284 371</sup> *Andr*<sup>Crit</sup>; (*εμβριμωσαμενος t<sup>ss</sup>, εμβριμωμενος K*).

John

- (xiv. 19. *ζησετε pro ζησεσθε* BLX 213 only, but adopted by *Tisch* on the ground that at v. 25, vi. 51 57 58 *ζησει* and *ζησουσιν* are found and not *ζησεται* and *ζησονται*, but, as he points out, *ζησεται* is found, without variation, at xi. 25. I place the matter here as it hardly seems right to put it under changes in verbal voices; yet a delicate shade of meaning seems to underlie one or other of these forms in the particular connection involved, and which one the writer of the Gospel used we shall never know. *W-H* follow BLX with *ζησετε*. *Soden* adds 213 (*Sod*<sup>129</sup>) but does not follow it, yet 213 is a regular adherent to and confirmer of the B transmission.)
- xv. 4. (*μην pro μεινη* NBL 33\* [*Sod*] 213 Paris<sup>97</sup> *W-H Sod txt.* "Form" or change of tense. But *Origen* *εμμεινη* and *Eus Cyr μεινη ut vid.*)
- ibid.* (*μηντε pro μεινητε* NABL *Sod*<sup>150\*</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> *W-H Sod txt.* The same applies here. Above *a* writes *maneant* but *manseritis* here, while *d* above has *manserit* (with most) but *maneatis* here.)
- { 5. *ουδε εν (pro ουδεν)* B. Cf. *CW Sod*<sup>541</sup> *ad xxi. 3 [non B]*
13. *ουδε εις (pro ουδεις)* B
- (6. *μην (pro μεινη)* N\*ABD Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>1222</sup> *W-H Sod txt.* Yet another Greek combination for this. *d* here has *maneant* but not *a* nor the rest.)
7. *ο αν θελητε* B 209 { *Rell ο εαν θελητε et W-H & Sod*<sup>541</sup>
- οσα εαν θελητε* N
- (8. *γενησθε pro γενησεσθε* BDLMXA *min pauc Amphil Chr W-H [non Sod]*. Ellipsis or intentional change? *γινεσθε* Paris<sup>97</sup>.)
22. *ειχουσαν (pro ειχον)* NBN\*LI<sup>2</sup> 1[*non fam*] 19 mg 33 j<sup>scr</sup> (*negl Tisch Sod*) *Sod*<sup>183</sup> [*non Ψ Paris*<sup>97</sup>] *Orig*<sup>codd non ubique</sup> *Cyr*<sup>ter</sup> *W-H Sod txt (ειχαν D\*)*.
24. *ειχουσαν (pro ειχον)* NBL\* (*hiat N*)II<sup>2</sup> 1[*non fam*] 19 mg 33 *Sod*<sup>150\*</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> *W-H Sod txt* against the rest and against *Cyr* here (*ειχαν D\**).
- xvi. 32. *καμε (pro και εμε)* NBC\*LNΨ 1[*non fam exc. Sod*<sup>183</sup>] 138 *Sod*<sup>Kc</sup> *Cyr W-H Sod txt* against the rest and *Const Did*.
- xvii. 6. *καμοι (pro και εμοι)* .BY *Sod*<sup>62</sup> 1[*non fam*] 33 138 *W-H [non Sod]* against N the rest and *Orig Eus Did Chr Cyr*.
- ibid fin. τετηρηκαν (pro τετηρηκασιν)* BDLW *Sod*<sup>52</sup> *solī vid et W-H [non Sod]*.

We have had imperfects (*ελεγαν*) and aorists (*ειπαν*) frequently. This is the first instance to be noticed of the perfect in this form. NN 33 substitute *ετηρησαν*. To the testimony of BDLW however we should add *e ff*

John

which read *τερρηκα* (*e servabi*, *ff servavi*). This various reading may have come from a copy in which the final *v* of *τερρηκα* had become lost before the *vuv* following—TETHPHKANYN—but observe *εγωνα* in the next verse, by a few cursives, is shared by most *latt vett* although no *N* follows there in the next word.

- xvii. 7. ἔδωκες (*pro* δέδωκας) B<sup>sol</sup> See under "Change of Tense."  
 8. ἔδωκες ( " " ) B<sup>sol</sup> " " " "  
 xviii. 6. ἀπῆλθαν NBDW W-H (*et* ἐπεσαν) NBCDELXW<sup>2</sup> 1 33 213  
 Sod<sup>Kl.55</sup> W-H *et* Sod).  
 29. φησιν (*pro* εἶπεν) NBC\*LXWΨ 1 [22 Soden. *Teste Sanders*  
*ex errore*] 33 213 2<sup>pe</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>541 1110</sup> K. C Cyr Chr<sup>11b</sup> W-H  
 Sod *txt.*  
 xix. 3. ἐδίδουσαν (*pro* ἐδιδουν) NBLNXWΨ 1 22 138 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 (*cum* LX  
 ἐδίδουσαν) Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>178</sup> K. Cyr W-H Sod *txt.*  
 11. ο παραδους (*pro* ο παραδιδους) Either ellipsis or a variation  
 witnessed to by NBEΔΔ W-H<sup>txt</sup> [*non* Sod] Sod<sup>7050 1089</sup> K.55  
 min<sup>aliq</sup>, but not the ones we expect, nor by WΨ Paris<sup>97</sup>,  
 but = *it vq syr qui tradidit.*  
 12. ἐκρανυγασαν BD<sup>sup</sup> Ψ 33 157 249 w<sup>cr</sup> al<sup>10</sup> Sod<sup>211q</sup> W-H [*non*  
 Sod<sup>txt</sup>] *a*, but this is a change of tense as well. See under  
 "Change without Improvement."  
 xx. 4. ταχειον (*pro* ταχιον) B *al* aliq *et* W-H [*non* N]  
 (I have neglected the oft recurring differences between N  
 and B as to πειλατος and πιλατος, εισηκει and ιστηκει)  
 16. ραββουνει BN sah Evst<sup>Amélineau p. 63</sup> W-H (ραββωνει D)  
 23. αφειονται B (αφιονται W-H<sup>we</sup>; αφεωνται W-H<sup>txt</sup> Sod<sup>txt</sup> *cum*  
 N<sup>c</sup>ADOX Sod<sup>7050</sup> *al.* Cyr, *et* αφιενται plur *et* Orig.  
 25. χειραν BW and A c<sup>scr</sup>, but (see under "Genitive before  
 the Noun") BW μου την χειραν, whereas A c<sup>scr</sup> την χειραν  
 μον. (τας χειρας, — μου D *d.*)  
 xxi. 4. γεινομενης BA [*non* D *hoc loco, sed* DA *ver* 5  
 προσφαγειον, *non* B]  
 15. πλεον (*pro* πλειον) NBCDLSXΛΩ 4 33 122 314 Sod<sup>Kl</sup> Chr  
 Cyr W-H Sod *txt* [against the rest and Basil] πλιον N *al*?  
 (1 22 2<sup>pe</sup> Sod<sup>178</sup> *a b c e ff r aur syr sin* omit πλ. τουτων.)

*Synonyms.*

**John**

- i. 40 (*St. Tisch, ver 39 W-H Sod*). *οψεσθε* (*pro ιδετε*) BC\*LT<sup>b</sup>W  
X<sup>b</sup> (*Sod*<sup>A4</sup>) Ψ *fam 1 22 33 Paris*<sup>97</sup> (*Orig*) *W-H Sod txt.*

This appears rather more euphonious as: *ερχεσθε και οψεσθε* than *ερχεσθε και ιδετε*. The latter is supported by the mass and  $\Sigma$  and by *Epiph Cyr Chr.* As CLT<sup>b</sup> and WΨ join B for

John

οψεσθε with 1 22 33 Paris<sup>97</sup> it may well be fundamental as regards *Egypt*, but not necessarily as regards fundamental *neutrality*. [See Abbott for particulars as to Johannine diction in this respect.]

- iv. 51. *υπηντησαν* (*pro απηντησαν*) See in St. Matthew's Gospel as to this pp. 24/26.
- vi. 2. *εθεωρουν* BDLNX<sup>b</sup>Ψ(A) 69 185 397 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>190</sup> 1443 κ, Cyr W-H Sod *txt* for *εωρων* (*θεωρουντες pro οτι εωρων* W, *εθεωρει* Laura<sup>A</sup> 104, *εωρακεν* Sod<sup>1091</sup>) involves a discussion of the synonyms for seeing and beholding *etc.* in this Gospel (see Abbott, 'Johannine Synonyms,' § 1598) and would not be profitable enough to discuss at length here, so that it need not detain us. I will only remark that in this same chapter at verse 19 *θεωρουσιν* occurs, at verse 40 *ο θεωρων*, and at verse 62 *θεωρητε* (or *θεωρειτε*), without variation among mss, so that a change has been wilfully made here in verse 2 by one party or the other. Which is the most likely to have altered the word? (At vi. 36 *εωρακατε* occurs, and at vi. 46 *εωρακεν*, in both places unchanged except for *Evan.* 28 in the latter place, which *ms* merely adds *επιγινωσκει η* before *εωρακεν* (*sic*) *pr. loco.*)
- [vii. 49. *επαρατοι* (*pro επικαταρατοι*) NBTW Sod<sup>980</sup> 1[*non fam*] 33 2<sup>va</sup> Sod<sup>κ</sup> [non *al. vid*] Orig Cyr W-H Sod *txt*. This may be ellipsis, or it may indicate a preference, or it may be basic, for *επικαταρατοι* is the expression throughout the LXX from Genesis to Jeremiah and therefore may have replaced *επαρατοι*.]
- viii. 16. *αληθινη* (*pro αληθης*) See under "Improvement."
- x. 3. *φωνει* (*pro καλει*) NABDLXWΨ *fam* 1 33 157 213 249 397 2<sup>pe</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>541</sup> 1110 1114 κ, N<sup>40</sup> Cyr W-H Sod *txt*. It does not follow that the rest are wrong with *καλει*. The change may have been made by "scholars" for alliterative purposes following *φωνης αυτου ακουει* in the verse.
- xii. 3. *επλησθη* (*pro επληρωθη*) in the phrase "*η δε οικια επλη. εκ της σσμης του μυρου.*" This reading is found in B only, and is put aside by Hort and R.V. as not worthy of notice. The viciousness of their "note" system is shown here, for neither Hort nor Souter give the reading in their notes, and the ordinary minor student, who is compelled to use these tomes, thinks of course that B agrees with the text *επληρωθη* as printed. But B deliberately used a word which is practically *non Johannine* (Soden does not add one single new witness for *επλησθη*), for the *πλησαντες* of many at John xix. 29 [the only place in which a form of *πληθω* or *πιμπλημι* is found in the fourth Gospel] does not find any room in NBLX who



John

use a different sentence (σπογγον ουν μεστον οξους προ οι δε πλησαντες σπογγον οξους και) whereas πληρωω is fully Johannine, occurring at :

- iii. 29. αυτη ουν η χαρα η εμη πεπληρωται
- vii. 8. οτι ο εμος καιρος (vel ο καιρ. ο εμος) ουπω πεπληρωται
- xii. 38. ινα ο λογος Ησaiου του προφ. πληρωθη
- xiii. 18. αλλ ινα η γραφη πληρωθη
- xv. 25. αλλ ινα πληρωθη ο λογος
- xvi. 6. αλλ οτι ταυτα λελαληκα υμιν, η λυπη πεπληρωκεν υμων την καρδιαν
- 24. ινα η χαρα υμων ᾗ πεπληρωμενη (Cf. I Jo. i. 4, II Jo. 12)
- xvii. 12. ινα η γραφη πληρωθη
- 13. ινα εχωσιν την χαραν την εμην πεπληρωμενην εν εαυτοις
- xviii. 9. ινα πληρωθη ο λογος ον ειπεν
- 32. ινα ο λογος του Ιησου πληρωθη
- xix. 24. } ινα η γραφη πληρωθη
- 36. }

besides πληρωμα in John i. 16 (a word not used by St. Luke, who on the other hand uses forms of πληθω freely).

Further, πληρωω is found in St. John's epistles :

- I John i. 4. ινα η χαρα υμων ᾗ πεπληρωμενη (Cf. Jo. xvi. 24)
  - II John ver. 12. ινα η χαρα υμων πεπληρωμενη ᾗ (N) B vg. (Rell ᾗ πεπληρ.)
- in the same phrase as in the Gospel at xvi. 24.

Yet, if the critics could rake up from the Libraries a few Greek cursives with επλησθη in John xii. 3, upon their own foundations and rules they would be bound to insert the reading of B there. Such unscientific reasoning cannot affect Scripture harmfully here, since we are merely dealing with a synonym at this place. But the example is, or should be, a warning and a danger signal as to B's methods *elsewhere*. If B is "neutral" when he writes Ιησους for ὁ Ιησους, even when alone, as Hort insists by repeatedly placing the article in square brackets on those occasions, why in the name of common logic is B not right when he gives us such a fine "neutral" form as επλησθη, equally not found in other documents?

I insist, and I think the public will say with reason, instead of repeating to us *ad nauseam* what a fine man Hort was, and how much study underlay his text, that his followers should offer us some explanation of *why* they abandon B occasionally when that ms is affected by a bad "sunstroke," and not that they should cover up B's solecisms by a conspiracy and a mantle of silence (which I charge to be unfair). This remark applies with even greater force to the next place of this kind to be considered, viz. John xii. 28, where B and Evan 5 alone are guilty of something very serious. See under "Hopelessness of considering B neutral." Both Hort and Souter's Oxford edition abandon B, but cover up the matter by another conspiracy of silence.

John

- xiv. 7. In view of the foregoing, the next case may be referred with some confidence to an internal species of harmonistic effort (throwing some light on the other question of *εμεινεν* or *διετριβεν* at xi. 54. See under "Indeterminate.") I refer to the substitution of:

*αν ηδευτε* by BCQΨ 1[*non fam*] 33 *Ps-Ath Bas Cyr W-H*<sup>ms</sup> [*nil in mg*] *Sod*<sup>ms</sup> [*non txt*], or *αν ειδητε* L 2<sup>re</sup>, or *ειδητε αν* X, or *ηδευτε αν* 22 213 314 *Sod*<sup>173</sup>, for *εγνωκειτε αν*, which as Tischendorf carefully explains may be a reflection of John viii. 19. *NDW Paris*<sup>97</sup> substitute *γνωσεσθε* which Tischendorf receives into his text. *αν ηδευτε* seems very likely an importation from viii. 19.

### *Homoioteleuton.*

- iii. 25. *εκ των μαθητων των Ιωανου* B<sup>sol</sup> (but see under *Syriac*)  
ix. 7. *απηλθεν βλεπων* (— *ουν και ενιψατο και ηλθεν inter απηλθεν et βλεπων*) B<sup>sol</sup>

*Syr sin* however differs: "and when he washed his face his eyes were opened," leaving out any question of *ηλθεν* which caused trouble in B.

The *arm* is rather graphic here: "He went, washed, came and saw."

- x. 18. *ταυτην εντολην (pro ταυτην την εντολην)* B<sup>sol</sup>. This must be an error and cannot certainly be referred to any Latin influence yet *Sod*<sup>050</sup>, a thoroughly bilingual codex, alone now comes to join B at this place! Note the only *Greek* witness in xix. 26 for *αυτου post την μητερα* to join the Latins *a c n* is *Scd*<sup>030</sup> with Ω.

See beyond under the caption "Historic Present." It is *in the same verse* that NB alone substitute *ηπεν* for *αιρει*. I have directed attention to the *tullit* of *gat* at that place. Is it possible that Latin (*tulit* and *hoc mandatum*) is responsible for both *ηπεν* and *ταυτην εντολην* (— *την*)?

### *Homoioteleuton with Indeterminate Results.*

- xii. 35. *περιπατειτεως το φως εχετε*. Depending on how carefully the original was made and copied must depend the correctness of the double variety *περιπατειτε ως* or *περιπατειτε εως*. B favours the former. In verse 36 *ως* stands plainly by *ABDLWΠΨ Did Ath.*  
xiv. 22. *ΚΕΚΑΙΤΙΓΕΓΟΝΕΝ*. *και* has been inserted or dropped here owing to the proximity of *κε*. *Σ* and most have it. *BADELX* 33

397 Laura<sup>A 104</sup> Sod<sup>7337 1246 3371 Kc N</sup> Cyr latt copt syr arm aeth goth drop it as do *W-H* [*nil in mg*] but not *Soden* (I wonder why).

*Homoioteleuton and Homoioarcton.*

John

- xiv. 4. We can hardly attribute to homoioteleuton the shortened clause here. It would be charitable to do so, but it is evidently to remove an apparent (and not a real) pleonasm that **NBC**\*LQXW 33 157 213 (*Sod*<sup>178</sup>) *boh pers aeth*<sup>all</sup> and only *a r* of the Latins give us *και οπου (εγω) υπαγω οιδατε την οδον* with *W-H* and *Sod*, instead of *και οπου (εγω) υπαγω οιδατε, και την οδον οιδατε* of *D* and all the other fourteen uncials, all the cursives, *syriacs* (including *sin*), *sah*, *latt*, the other versions, and *Cyril*. Neither *Ψ* nor 892 follows the **NB** group here, and *Paris*<sup>97</sup> has *και οπου εγω υπαγω ουκ οιδατε την οδον*. (Observe that it is *boh* which supports **NB** etc., and not *sah*. Further remove "*al. pauc*" and "*al*" in *Tisch Horner* and *Scholz* after 33 157. It is doubtful whether any other cursives so far collated have the short form. Only the famous *Sod*<sup>129</sup> (= 213) appears as a new witness. Correct *Wetstein* also who cites *goth* for it.) *c*<sup>cr</sup>, not cited by *Tisch*, has *και οπου υπαγω εγω οιδατε* (— *και την οδον οιδατε*).
- xviii. 5. Where *D b e r* (*hiat d*) and *Origen* omit *ιησους* in the sentence: *λεγει αυτοις (Ιησους) εγω ειμι· ειστηκει δε και Ιουδας*, *B* alone with *a* changes the order thus: *λεγει αυτοις εγω ειμι ΙϞ ΙCΘΗΚΕΙ* placing *Ιησους* after *εγω ειμι* and changing the form of the address. This *ΙϞ* crept in from the margin into the wrong place, or is an error of homoioarcton from *ΙCΘΗΚΕΙ* following.
- Hort cut the difficulty by omitting *Ιησους* from his text (with *D* 435 *minn*<sup>5</sup> [*et Sod*<sup>841 1084</sup>] *b e r Orig*) but indicates it in his margin as an alternative reading to place it where *B* does. But *r* (closely related to *a*) by omitting shows that in *a* "Jesus" came in, as in *B*, from the margin. Why should we follow *B a* then and insert it in the wrong place? *a* shows up the whole thing by writing "*Jesus autem stabat et Judas...*"

*Compound for Simple Verb.*

John

- iv. 15. For *μηδε ερχομαι* (or *ερχομαι*) *ευθαδε αντλειν* of all others and *Orig* 1/5, **N**\**B* and *Orig* 4/5 (and these alone) write *μηδε διερχ...* (*διερχομαι B, διερχομαι N Orig*) *ευθαδε αντλειν*.

As to this, *Tischendorf* at last makes a remark which we eagerly avail ourselves of. He says: "(:: *ερχ- si scriptum fuisset, quis tandem διερχ- maluisset?*)"

After going through St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, and the first three and a half chapters of St. John, that is the best way he can put it. "If *ερχομαι* or *ερχωμαι* be original who would have thought of changing to *διερχ-*"! But, on the contrary, in the previous hundreds of pages in this volume we have seen **NB** and *Orig* constantly improving or trying to improve. The answer to Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort (for of course *διερχ-* is found in the latter's text, "*διερχωμαι*" with **N**, rather than B's *διερχομαι*, and no marginal comment) is that B often substitutes a simple for a compound verb, so that in these other cases an "Antioch" revision presupposes a change from simple to compound which "Antioch" would favor. Why then not here retain the compound if original? Further, the context shows that **ΕΡΧ** following **ΔΕ** in **ΜΗΔΕ** (**ΜΗΔΕΕΡΧΟΜΑΙ**) could easily give rise to *διερχωμαι*.

The middle-Egyptian fragment (published by Crum-Kenyon in J.T.S. vol. I does *not* have *διερχ*. (p. 428).

Dr. Souter in his latest pronouncement on B ('Text and Canon,' 1913, p. 22) after referring to conflation in B at Luke xii. 47, xix. 37, says: "But such features are like spots in the sun."† So carried away with B—(without real fundamental acquaintance with its *pervading* lack of neutrality, and indebtedness *throughout* to the "Version tradition")—was Hort, but Souter is absolutely inexcusable to write in this vein. For justification of our remark the reader need only read the previous and the subsequent pages in this volume. But on p. 103 Souter fairly eclipses anything so far said as to the wonderful labours of Westcott and Hort.

Now Dr. Souter is a capable and very well read man. Whence this fascination for an edition without fixed principles, or rather with an invented standard, and whose sponsors withheld (if they knew them) ‡ the rules which should govern in *identifying* readings? It is a strange situation. For fear that any student might be independent enough to think for himself once in a while, Dr. Souter delivers himself of this (p. 117): "In deciding as to which of one or more readings is the correct one, the final judgment lies with the trained common sense of the scholar. If it be replied that scholars differ, then the answer must be that for the untrained man *the opinion held by most scholars, or by those whose judgment is most highly esteemed by the body of scholars themselves, is that which will be most safely followed.*"

This is immediately succeeded by the following :

"There can be little question that of all texts now in existence that

† How about John iv. 46, Dr. Souter? Here B writes *ηθεν ουν παλιν εν κανα* for *ηλ. ουν παλ. εις την κανα*. Is this a sunspot or a sunstroke? [B is followed by **NX**<sup>b</sup> (= *Sod*<sup>A4</sup> tremendously *Latin*) *Sod*<sup>1043 1443</sup>].

‡ Hort's 'Introduction' has no adequate foundation for his text in the matter of examples. It is throughout "assumption" backed by wordy and pleonastic iteration, not by examples.

which commands the highest degree of assent *among those best qualified to judge* is that of Westcott and Hort."

Now the first part *sounds* logical enough, but it certainly is illogical to follow it up with the subsequent renewal of idolatrous admiration for Westcott and Hort, because Dr. Souter himself consented to allow his name to appear on the title-page of the Oxford edition, from which many of Hort's readings are ejected, whether Souter approved or not.

We return to John iv. 15 where the Oxford edition is satisfied to leave *διερχώμαι* of *NB Tisch* and *W-H* in the text. The Revision thus shares Tischendorf's and Hort's ideas that it would be folly to suppose that anyone finding *ερχώμαι* should have revised to *διερχώμαι*.

Very well. That presupposes that every other Greek ms (including mind you, DLWΨ *Sod*<sup>950</sup> 1 13 22 28 33 127 157 213 604 892 Paris<sup>91</sup> all extant here, besides hosts of other important witnesses including *Soden's* sympathetic codices from Sinai and Jerusalem) *have been revised FROM A COMMON ORIGINAL*, which we happen to know is not the case, because most of these MSS have a partial base conforming to *N* and *B*. [*Soden* cannot produce a single new witness agreeing with *N* or *B*.]

It presupposes that every latin base has been revised (for none read the equivalent of *διερχώμαι*) although in countless places in the neighbourhood some and often many Latins are found with *N* or *B*.

It presupposes that *D* has also been tampered with, and *W*.

Why this elaborate and terrific difficulty, instead of recognizing that our good old friend, the precursor of *NB* and contemporary of Origen, calmly made use of his little "improvements" or suffered one of his "lapses" from homoioteleuton.

The *sah* and *slav* versions have "and I should not come out," while *aeth* expresses "et non veniam huc iterum." *vg*<sup>R</sup> adds *amplius*. Otherwise nothing lends its countenance to *διερχ.* which is opposed by *Origen*<sup>4, 220</sup> himself, and by *Cyr* two hundred years later, which is a poor commentary on the "watchfulness of Alexandrian scholars" (*Hort*) if *διερχ.* had been correct.

As a matter of fact, but for *διερχεσθαι* in this same chapter (Jo. iv. 4), *διερχώμαι* is foreign to St. John's diction, while being exceedingly common to that of St. Luke.† A glance at the concordance will show the situation.

I think therefore that it is not a question of Tischendorf's "quis tandem *διερχ.* maluisset," but that *διερχ.* is an error from the *MHAE* preceding.

Dr. Hort (vol. ii. p. 226) explains his decision thus :

"*Διέρχωμαι* is here used in its idiomatic sense 'come all the way,' which expresses the woman's sense of her often repeated toil."

Exactly. Thus *NB* "improved" the record.

† Twenty times in Acts, ten times in St. Luke's Gospel.

Hort continues: "Being commonly used in other senses, the word was easily misunderstood and assumed to be inappropriate; and the change would be helped by the facility with which one of two similar consecutive syllables drops out."

We are face to face here with Dr. Hort's whole mental attitude in these matters and with our own. His studies led him to presuppose innocent copying on the part of B (p. 237), and a very pure archetype from which B was copying. Our investigations reveal a surprising degree of the contrary elements pervading B, of which we are giving examples at full length. Having established that the B text is full of "improvements," we can only rank *διερχομαι* as another in the same class. Dr. Hort sees here the foundation text, abandoned by all copies, scribes, and versions, because the true sense (which he alone appreciates) was "easily misunderstood." But the copyists and translators of antiquity did not act thus, and there is no trace of this left elsewhere, except in the *aethiopic* version (as recorded above) which once more reduces Hort's mental attitude, and that of *Σ* and B and their progenitors, to Egyptian soil. Hort says *διερχ.* means "'come all the way,' which expresses the woman's sense of her *often repeated* toil." Exactly thus INTERPRETS *aeth* alone, retaining *ερχομαι* but adding *iterum*! And so INTERPRETS *Ephr* (against *sy*r and *diatess*)!

John

iv. 16. Immediately following this, we find *σου τον ανδρα* by B and seven cursives which is the coptic method (for *τον ανδρα σου*) and where *Orig* 3/6 3/6 is on both sides.

What happened to *Σ* here? And W? What science is there in establishing *διερχ.* as "neutral" and basic in iv. 15 if in the very next verse we cannot tell what is and what is not neutral? Of course Hort knew, for he had support for B from a mixed lot of cursives: 69 [*contra fam*] 71 74 248 254 *Evst* 32 and 60 [*contra* *Evan* 157 its sister], (*Soden* only adds <sup>190</sup> *N11*) so he placed the B reading in his text. But he is only following a "version tradition," one "version tradition," and that of Egypt, in so doing. Naturally, when you establish an *arbitrary* "neutral" text and make it a standard you can be free to act as you wish. This utterly unscientific stand (*διερχομαι* in verse 15) is now found to be adopted by the *R.V.* as exhibited in the Oxford edition of 1910 after thirty years' and more experience since Hort's text was published. I can only say that the "majority of scholars" cited by Souter *may* be right, but I prefer to remain with the late Dr. Salmon, Canon Cook, Adalbert Merx and others in the minority. "Facts are stubborn things," as Adalbert Merx quotes on the first page of his first volume. I will *not* accept all B's strange readings and aberrations because I am told to do so. Souter's apostle Burkitt (see the unstinted praise on p. 129 of Souter's 'Text and Canon') himself is on my side with Turner and others against this idolatry and even *von Soden* abandons *ΣB* and *Orig* 3/4 here.

## VERB FORM CHANGES.

## Change of Voice.

John	v. 25. ακουσουσιν	B 22 138 357 ? (257 Tisch) Sod <sup>341</sup> Chr <sup>bis</sup> Cyr <sup>bis</sup> Hipp (Soden) et W-H txt.
	ακουσασιν	NL <sup>T</sup> 1[non fam] 33 69[non fam] 157 185 213 314 2 <sup>pe</sup> et WΨ Paris <sup>97</sup> Sod <sup>190</sup> 1468 K <sup>a</sup> et Sod txt.
	(audiunt	c f vg <sup>M</sup> )
	but ακουσονται	DAΓΔΑΠ unc <sup>8</sup> minn pl et Hipp <sup>bis</sup> (Lagarde)
ibid.	ζησουσιν	NBDL et T <sup>W</sup> 1[non fam] 22 33 357 2 <sup>pe</sup> z <sup>cr</sup> † Laura <sup>A 104</sup> [Soden non Lake] Paris <sup>97</sup> [non 346 teste Ferrar] Sod <sup>1266</sup> W-H Sod txt.
	but ζησονται	ΑΓΔΑΠ unc <sup>8</sup> al <sup>pl</sup> Hipp <sup>bis</sup> Chr <sup>bis</sup> Cyr.

As to the more recently recovered witnesses, W and Paris<sup>97</sup> join NB in both places, but Ψ has ακουσασιν and leaves ζησονται alone, thus agreeing with Chr and Cyr, and 892 makes no change from the textus receptus; the new witness T<sup>1</sup>, of course wholly 'Egyptian,' agrees as would be expected with W.

The suspicious thing here is the position observed in Cyr and Chr, which is reversed in D, while the 1 and 13 families are divided. Would it not be better to follow Hippolytus rather than strain at the more or less imaginary "neutral" text here? Hipp is absent in the following but Chr and Cyr are on both sides.

John	v. 28. ακουσουσιν	BT <sup>1</sup> [negl. Sod] 157 Sod <sup>351</sup> Chr 1/2 Cyr <sup>txt</sup> W-H txt.
	ακουσασιν	NLNA (Sod <sup>660</sup> ) 33 213 397 Paris <sup>97</sup> et W Laura <sup>A 104</sup> Sod <sup>1266</sup> K <sup>a</sup> Sod txt [non 2 <sup>pe</sup> ]

but ακουσονται DAΓΑΠ unc<sup>8</sup> rell minn Chr 1/2 Cyr<sup>com</sup> Bas

Here W again agrees, and T<sup>1</sup> with B, but not Ψ, and 892 is again noticeable by absence from agreement with N or B. Observe that 1 and 69 do not repeat their change here and Sod<sup>660</sup> has ακουσουσονται sic. Paris<sup>97</sup> (with Orig) adds και οι ακουσαντες ζησουσιν repeating and confirming ζησουσιν of verse 25, and thus is more consistent than Ψ which abstains from change here.

John

x. 14. See under "Coptic and Latin."

† Soden does not give Laura<sup>A 104</sup> at verse 28 below (his 1279). Has he copied wrongly from Lake?

John

- (xiv. 19. *ζησετε προ ζησεσθε* See under "Form.")  
 xiv. 23. *ποιησομεθα (προ ποιησομεν)* See under "Improvement" and  
 note very specially.

### Change of Mood.

- xiii. 2. *παραδοι (προ παραδω)* **NBD** [*non T'W rel*]  
*(Cf. xiii. 29 ινα τι δοι D)*

As to whether *αι* really represents a change of mood or not in **NBD** here and elsewhere, it is worth noting that the new ms **W** has *εγνοι* for *εγνω* in xvi. 19, so that *αι* for *ω* may merely be itacismic in **NBD**.

But see Matt. xviii. 30 *αποδη* **N** (*vulg<sup>rob</sup> αποδοιη*) *προ αποδω* [not cited by *Tisch* or *Sod*], noticed by us in Postscript to Part II.

I have neglected all changes of mood following *ινα*. They seem of no value in the premises.

John

- xiv. 15. *τηρησετε (προ τηρησατε)* **BLΨ** [*Sod non Lake*] 54 73 *Laura*<sup>A 104</sup>  
*Sod*<sup>190 351 1191 1110 1349 K<sub>1</sub></sup> *W-H* [*non Sod txt*] only and *sah boh arm*  
 future against imperative of the rest and the other versions  
 (**N** 33 *Paris*<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>13</sup> and a few *τηρησητε*).

### Change of Tense.

- iv. 21. *πιστευε (προ πιστευουσιν)* **NBC\*DLW** 1 22\* 138 *fam* 13 [*non*  
 124] 2<sup>ps</sup> *Laura*<sup>A 104</sup> *Sod*<sup>190 1110 K<sub>1</sub></sup> [*male vid Sod*<sup>350</sup> = *i<sup>scr</sup>*] *sah Orig*  
*Ath Cyr W-H*<sup>txt</sup> *Sod*<sup>ms</sup> [*non*<sup>txt</sup>]

- vi. 12. We may include under this head *τα περισσευοντα* by **B** only  
 and 40 63 64 71 *al*<sup>5</sup> *Sod*<sup>1094 fam C</sup> [not indulged in by the real  
 sympathising cursives] for *τα περισσευσαντα* of all the rest  
 and *Cyr* (*περισσευματα* & *alig.*). Neither *W-H* nor *Soden*  
 follow **B** here.

(A change of number occurs in the very next verse.)

- vii. 19. *εδωκεν* **BDHΠ**<sup>2</sup> 240 244 359 *hi soli inter omn et W-H*<sup>txt</sup>  
*(προ δεδωκεν N rel)*

In these connections we must consider St. John's manner. He employs the perfect almost habitually.

39. *οι πιστευσαντες (προ οι πιστευοντες)* **BLT** (*πιστευουσιν*) **W**  
*Erst* 18 *syr sin* (*cf. sah*) *Chrys*<sup>cod A</sup> and *W-H txt* [*nil in mg*],  
 but apparently no others. *Soden* gives no new witnesses.  
 viii. 23. *ελεγεν (προ ειπεν)* **NBDLNTXW** *fam* 13 [*non* 124]  
*Laura*<sup>A 104</sup> [*negl Sod*] *Sod*<sup>7541 1114 Lm C</sup> *it<sup>pl</sup> vg Orig Cyr W-H Sod*  
*txt.*

This looks like a strong combination, but it is opposed by all the sympathising cursives and 1 33 892 *Paris*<sup>97</sup> and **Ψ**. Why? Because *ειπεν* is right. The small band above changed merely in order to conform to *ελεγον* above in verse 22. Again a question of "pairs." *Ver* 22 *ελεγον ουν οι*



Ιουδαιοι... , then why not, said they, *και ελεγεν αυτοις* in *ver* 23. There would be no reason to change to *ειπεν* if *ελεγεν* were basic.

viii. 39. See under "Improvement."

The number of cases of change of tense in the Gospels can be doubled if we consider the readings of **N** as well as those of **B** or **NB** together.

x. 18. *ηεν* (*pro aipei*) **NB** *solī cum W-H*. See p. 354.

21. *ανοιξει* **NBLXX<sup>b</sup>W** *Sod*<sup>750</sup> *fam* 1 *fam* 13 22\*\* 33 157 213 249\* 2<sup>pe</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>178 541 1110</sup> *fam* **CN** *Orig Chr W-H Sod txt*, against *ανοιγειν* by the great mass including **D**. This *ανοιξει* must be an "improvement" to fit the remark to chapter ix. where the record is so complete of a cure of the blind. I cannot conceive of a "revision" under all the circumstances changing *ανοιξει* to *ανοιγειν*.

25. *ουκ επιστευσατε* (*pro ου πιστευετε*) **B** 4 52 63 71 157 248 259 *Sod*<sup>1094</sup> *Chr*<sup>codd 27</sup> (+ *μοι*) (33? 251 *ουκ επιστευετε*) † [*non* Paris<sup>97</sup> *rell*].

Only the above-mentioned change, against all the rest and against the Versions. It is quite clear that it is an "improvement" (following *ειπον υμιν*) and not basic, and even Hort abandons **B** and does not record anything in his margin! The amusing thing is that King James' translators (although the previous editions and Tynedale had the present) have "and ye believed not," and Hort and the Revision actually set them straight here as against **B** and company, and of course the margin of the Revision is silent, whereas they could have mentioned **B** and ten other "ancient authorities" for the past tense.

The point to observe is that the transition from "*I TOLD you...to...and ye BELIEVE not*" offended **B**, and Hort by not accepting **B**'s "*I TOLD you...and ye BELIEVED not*" reproves **B** for an unnecessary nicety. Is not our case abundantly proved by this? If **B** is wrong here, he must be wrong in many of the other places which we have discussed. Fancy accepting *ηεν* of **NB** in x. 18 (*vide paullo post*) and rejecting this harmless reading of **B** *min*<sup>8</sup> in x. 25!

xi. 27. *πιστευω* (*pro πεπιστευκα*) **B**\* *o<sup>ect</sup>* (= *Sod*<sup>1386</sup>) *t<sup>ect</sup>* [*negl. Sod*] *sah boh* (and *syraeth* etc.). Also **A.V.**<sup>1611</sup> again. Not adopted by Hort.

See under "Coptic."

29. *εκεινη ως ηκουσεν, εγειρεται ταχυ και ερχεται προς αυτον*. So *Tischendorf* (against his own group)† with the *textus*

† "*Tischendorf's text is, in my own opinion, right in many places where the text of Hort is wrong.*" C. H. Turner (*J. T. S.* vol. xi. p. 189).

John

receptus and most, but against Hort's and Soden's: *εκεινη δε ως ηκουσεν ηγερθη ταχυ και ηρχετο προς αυτον* with **NBC(D)LXW** 33 213 249 397 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>1119 1114 latm N</sup> [*d* has *surrexit* and *venit*, D<sup>87</sup> *ηγερθη και ερχεται*, clearly a *Latin* influence on his Greek].

I suggest that this small but important group is perpetrating another "improvement," objecting to the transition from the past tense *ηκουσεν* to the graphic historic presents *εγειρεται* and *ερχεται*. So at least thought Tischendorf, no mean judge of such matters, and he condemns his beloved **N** by absolutely neglecting its testimony, down to the suppression of the connecting *δε* at the head of the verse.†

- xii. 13. *εκραυγασαν* (*pro* *εκραυγαζον* **NB<sup>3</sup>DLQW** *et* *εκραζον* *unc* *rell*)  
B<sup>201\*</sup> *inter gr cum sah et goth.*

49. An exception to the rule of "pairs" is made here, and instead of *ελαλησα...εδωκεν*, we are treated to *ελαλησα...δεδωκεν* by **NBAMX** and **WΨ** *al. pauc.* Did *Cyr W-H Sod txt*, while the rest favour *εδωκεν*. Now *δεδωκεν* may have been introduced by **NB** *etc.* to conform to St. John's more usual use of the perfect, or the other side may have revised to *εδωκεν* (but observe that **DD**, the graeco-latins, have the aorist) for the sake of the "pair." We will not insist. For at xiii. 3 **NBKLT<sup>W</sup>** 138 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>K<sup>1</sup></sup> have *εδωκεν*.

- xiii. 19. *πιστευητε* (*pro* *πιστευσητε*) **BC** *Orig* 1/2 *et W-H txt* [*nil in mg*]

37. *ακολουθειν* (*pro* *ακολουθσαι*) **B** and **C** only. This is a most glaring *change*, yet Hort follows in his text without marginal alternative. And this amounts to following **B** *alone*, because he prints *ακολουθειν αρτι*, whereas **C** (the only other authority for the present infinitive) has *νυν ακολουθειν*. Moreover the fact of wilful change is shown by **C**, who alone with *Evan* 96 and *Cyr* also changes *νυν ακολουθσαι* in verse 36 to *νυν ακολουθειν*. The Oxford edition of 1910 representing the Revisers acknowledges that **BC** and Hort are wrong, for it restores *ακολουθσαι* without marginal comment. Upon what principle then do Souter and the critics so earnestly commend Hort's "foundations"? Once more they are shown to be imbedded in sand, and to represent the perishing piles of **B**. For the present infinitive is clearly introduced because of the propinquity of *νυν* and *αρτι* both in verses 36 and 37. (Some few MSS, viz. 157 with 47 435 and the Latinisers 56 58 61, remove *αρτι* altogether in this verse 37. **NXW** vary the order

† See my remarks as to this in Part II. under "Versions."

John

of the following clause to *υπερ σου την ψυχην μου θησω*, and some would couple *αρι* with this sentence.)

- xiv. 10. οὐ πιστευσεις (*pro* οὐ πιστευεις) B<sup>801</sup>. This is a very pretty place, and will appeal to Coptic scholars, if not to my less well-informed critics. I know of no other authority for this except the *bohairic* version (all codices) which very definitely has the second person singular of the future tense: **ⲭⲛⲁⲅⲥⲁⲛ** against the transliterated **ⲡⲉⲛⲓⲥⲧⲉⲧⲉ ⲁⲛ** of *sah*. Could anything be more definite as to the situation as between B and the *bohairic*?

13. *αιτητε* (*pro* *αιτησητε*) B(*αιτηται*) Q only, is presumably the present conjunctive, unless merely a matter of "form," but both coptics have definitely the future. [In verse 14 B reads *αιτησητε* with the rest]. See below at xv. 16.

17. See under "Improvement."

- |   |                            |                  |   |  |
|---|----------------------------|------------------|---|--|
| { | xv. 4. <i>bis in versu</i> | See under "Form" | } | In verse 7 <i>μεινhte</i> and <i>μεινη</i> are retained by those who change in verses 4 and 6. |
|   | 6.                         | " " "            |   |  |

16. *αιτητε* (*pro* *αιτησητε*) BLΨ [*non* Paris<sup>91</sup> *non al. vid.*]. B is the only one to have this *both here and at* xiv. 13 (see above). It may be a version influence, but it occurs here in B at the end of a line. It can also be referred here to a continuation of the tense in the verse of *να υμεις υπαγητε...φερητε...μεινη...αιτητε*. This would bear out the general preference for "pairs" as explained elsewhere. On the other hand, in the actual sentence *αιτητε* would not square with *δω* following (of B *etc.*). We would have the *pres. subj.* followed by the *aorist subj.* in this last clause *να οτι αν αιτητε του πρα εν τω ονοματι μου δω υμιν*, whereas we might expect *διδω*. **Σ**, some cursives and *Cyr* force the future *δωσει* † on us to square with *αιτησητε*. Any way we look at it there has been forced tinkering with the passage, for others read *δωη*. As none read *διδω* we may look with suspicion on *αιτητε* of BLΨ, which *Hort* merely places in his margin.

- xvi. 22. *αρει* (*pro* *αιρει*) BD\*Γ (*ερει* N) *sah boh arm aeth W-H*<sup>121</sup> *Sod*<sup>98</sup>. Cf. *Hil et tollet c d δ gat aur Aug vg*<sup>15</sup>, *auferet a ff r Cyr* (*αφερει* W), *aufert e f q; tollit b vg*<sup>10</sup>. See under "Improvement."

- xvii. 7. *εδωκες* B, *εδωκας* A [*non fam*] 118<sup>22</sup> a<sup>82</sup> Paris<sup>91</sup> *Sod*<sup>92</sup> *W-H*<sup>121</sup> (*pro* *δεδωκας* *rell*)

8. *εδωκες* B, *εδωκας* ACDΠ\*W *minn pauc W-H*<sup>121</sup> (*pro* *δεδωκας* *longe plur et Cyr*).

21. *πιστευη* (*pro* *πιστευση*) **Σ**\*BC\*W *Clem Eus W-H* [*non Sod*],

† And *fam* 18 have *τοῦτο ποιητω* *etc.*

John

but against the rest and *Orig Ath Cyr*. Probably to conform in a measure to πιστευοντων in verse 20, for πιστευοντων is the correct reading there.

- xix. 12. *εκραυγασαν* BD<sup>sup</sup>Ψ *min*<sup>allq</sup> a *W-H txt* [*nil mg*]. See under "Change without Improvement." (*ελεγον pro εκπ. λεγοντες* **N**; cf. **NW** in xix. 15.)

15. πιστευητε (*pro πιστευσητε*) **N**\*BΨ (verse number wrong in Lake) *Orig W-H* [*nil mg*] (Latins *credatis*) against all the rest (*Soden* adds no new witnesses although printing in his text πιστευ[σ]ητε) including *W Paris*<sup>97</sup> and *Cyr* [*e* and *vg*<sup>F</sup> omit the verse, but not the *Diat*<sup>rab</sup> nor any other authorities (*sy* *sin* still missing until xix. 41, but *pers* has it)].

- xx. 31. πιστευητε (*pro πιστευσητε*) **N**\*B *Sod*<sup>950</sup> *W-H txt* [*nil mg*] (Latins *credatis*) against all the rest including *W* the new fragment *T*<sup>o</sup> (*Amélineau* p. 47) and the *Eust.* in same publication (p. 63) and *Cyr* again [*Origen* is absent]. Will *Soden* please explain why at xix. 35 he prints πιστευ[σ]ητε and gives *H*<sup>81-2\*</sup> 88 Ωρ in his upper margin, while here at xx. 31 he prints πιστευσητε (against *Hort*) and places πιστευητε *H*<sup>81-2\*</sup> *I*<sup>950</sup> in his second column of notes, although he adds *I*<sup>950</sup>?

- xxi. 6. ισχυον (*pro ισχυσαν*) **NBCDLNAPΨ** [*non W*] 1 [*non fam*] 4 15 27? 29? 33 124 [*non fam*] 262 270 *aopw*<sup>scr</sup> *Laura*<sup>A 104</sup> *Sod*<sup>351 1089 1110</sup> *Cyr W-H Sod txt et valebant c g δ gat foss aur dim vgg*<sup>omn vid</sup>, poterant a b d f r [*hiat ff, non e q*].

- †25. χωρησειν (*pro χωρησαι*) **BC**\* et **N**<sup>s</sup> et *Sod*<sup>1121 sol</sup> *Orig* 1/4 (1/4 *χωρειν, bis χωρησαι*). The fluctuation of *Origen* probably indicates revision and preference by *B*, for **BC**\***N**<sup>s</sup> are not even joined by *W* or *Ψ* nor by a single minuscule except *Sod*<sup>1121</sup> = *Sinai*<sup>182</sup> (only *c*<sup>cr</sup> *χωραισεν sic*). But *Hort*'s and *Souter*'s editions both adopt *χωρησειν*. *Soden* does not.

### (Historic Present.)

As against the frequent change by **NB** in the other Gospels in favour of present or imperfect† over the past tense, there is but little to note in *St. John's Gospel*. In fact at:

† *Om. verse N*<sup>\*</sup>.

‡ *Obs.* 892 but not **N** or *B* at ix. 40 ηκουον for ηκουσαν and *obs.* **N** alone at xi. 48 *εκραυγαζεν* (of the Lord's command to Lazarus) for *εκραυγασεν*. Only two vulgates *OT* have clamabit *sic*, simply an error for clamavit.

Note also at xi. 8 *εφιδεις for φιδεις* by *L Eust* 29 *Sod*<sup>2017</sup> *arm.* Observe **N** at xvii. 12 *εφυλασσον* for *εφυλαξα*. There is a gross error here in *Soden*'s notes. He adds *d r* to **N** for *εφυλασσον*. They do not read thus. Both *custodivi*. He has confused their reading of *custodiebam* for *servabam* as an interpretation of *ετηρουν* earlier in the verse. Perhaps the eye of **N** was similarly misled!

John

- x. 18. **NB** and they alone curiously enough substitute *ἦεν* for *αἶρει* in the clause *οὐδεὶς αἶρει αὐτὴν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ* (of *τὴν ψυχὴν* verse 17) *ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τίθημι αὐτὴν ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ*, where **NB** must be wrong. They are opposed by **8°** and the rest *Origen*<sup>quater</sup> et *Orig*<sup>int</sup> *Eusebius*<sup>quinq</sup> *Didymus*<sup>pluries</sup> et al., and it is scarcely credible, but *Westcott-Hort*, acting on their rule that **NB** in combination cannot be wrong, actually insert *ἦεν* into their text, which has overflowed ("some ancient authorities read") into the margin of the English Revision of 1881. The Greek *R.V.* naturally restores *αἶρει* to the text, but could not resist putting *ἦεν* in the margin. The versions and every other Greek document are clear for the present tense *αἶρει*.

Instead of *tollit* of most Latins I find *gat* has *tullit*. Is it possible that this *ἦεν* crept into **NB** from a graeco-latin with *tullit* or *tulit*?†

*Soden* cannot find a single new witness for this absurd reading. Observe that it is in this same verse that **B** (alone with *Sod*<sup>750</sup>) has *ταυτὴν ἐντολὴν*, "*hoc mandatum*" or "*hoc praeceptum*" for *ταυτὴν τὴν ἐντολὴν* of all the rest.

40. *εμεῖνεν* (*pro εμεινεν*) is found in **B** [apparently alone of Greeks with 21 (*Sod*<sup>750</sup>)] with *a b c e ff l* of Latins [*non d f r δ*]. *Syr sin* apparently alone with *pers* and *Chr*<sup>codd 5/6</sup> omits *καὶ εμεινεν ἐκεῖ*, or rather may agree with *pers* alone, and suppressing *εμεινεν* transfer *καὶ ἐκεῖ* to the head of the following verse. (*Syr pesh* has *ἦν* or *ῥῖν* for *εμεινεν*.) *W-H*<sup>1st</sup> prints *εμεῖνεν* alone with **B**, and now 21.
- xii. 23. Here occurs a real Historic present: *ἀποκρίνεται* (*pro ἀπεκρίνατο* of nearly all and *ἀπεκριθῆ* of the few) by **NBLXW** 33 *Sod*<sup>750</sup> and Paris<sup>97</sup> *W-H* [*non Sod*] and by them alone. All clearly representing one influence and one stem. And absolutely deliberate and eclectic as will be shown immediately, because two verses below at:
25. we find *ἀπολλυεῖ* substituted for *ἀπολεσεῖ*, but only by **NBLW** 33 *Sod*<sup>751</sup> ff. Here **X** and Paris<sup>97</sup> abandon the group. They have been "revised" if you will, it matters not whether they have been revised or hold the true base exhibited by all others. The reason **NBLW** 33 adopt *ἀπολλυεῖ* is apparently because it follows so close to *φέρει* at the end of the previous verse: *εάν δε ἀποθάνῃ πολὺν καρπὸν φέρει . ο φιλῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολλυεῖ αὐτὴν*. Thus it not only bears on the previous *φέρει* but has reference to the harmonising of *φιλῶν* with *ἀπολλυεῖ*,

† For *ἦεν* at John v. 9 *e q* have *tulit*, and not *sustulit*; at John xi. 41 for *ἦεν* all Latins (except *p r*) have *tulerunt*, and not *sustulerunt*.

John

and thus constitutes another affair of "pairs." There can be no question about it. They do not however change *φυλαξει* in the next clause, which only shows how imperfect, or rather personal, was this Alexandrian revision. I speak with some confidence—as I draw towards the close of this essay—for if "Antioch" had been the censor here, besides changing *απολλυει* to *απολεσει*, why did they leave *φέρει* alone and not change that to a future *οἴσει*?

As a matter of fact *Origen* and *Nonnus* exhibit to us the attitude of the ancient minds at this place for they *do* write *φυλασσει* for *φυλαξει*, and *ff* with its Egyptian affinity writes *perdit...odit...custodit* (*b c f l* *custodit*).

Will *Soden* explain why he rejects *αποκρινεται* of **NBLXW** 33 Paris<sup>97</sup> in verse 23 and adopts *απολλυει* of **NBLW** 33 *Sod*<sup>541</sup> *ff* in verse 25?

- xiii. 38. Again here, as at xii. 23, we find *αποκρινεται* substituted for *απεκριθη* by a somewhat larger group involving **NABCLXW** *Sod*<sup>550</sup> *fam* 1 *fam* 13 22 33 138 157 213 254 2<sup>re</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>190</sup> 361 *W-H Sod txt.* *Tisch* says of the *minn* "al<sup>10</sup>," but observe that only *fam* 1 *fam* 13 22 138 157 213 and 254 of the same family tendencies swell the chorus of 33 Paris<sup>97</sup> sung in the former place. *Syr* is *λεγει*, but all *latt* respondit as at xii. 23. *αποκρινεται* seems clearly an "improvement" by the few. Observe their record in the other Gospels as to Historic presents. So far in St. John they had successfully resisted the temptation to change. If really basic how is it that *fam* 1 *fam* 13 22 138 157 213 and 254 did not follow in xii. 23 as well as in xiii. 38?

### Change of Number.

- vi. 13. *επερισσευσαν* (controlled by *δ*) **BDE<sup>s</sup>W** 67 *Sod*<sup>190</sup> *Evst* 60 (*P<sup>scr</sup>*) *copt lat W-H* [*non Sod*] against the singular *επερισσευσεν* by the rest and *Amélineau's* new Egyptian *Evst*, see his page 64, and (*απερ επερισσευσεν Cyr*). The plural is more or less Egyptian (Coptic) and the Latins use it. When *W* joins in these places with *D* it is a pretty clear intimation of "version" tradition and influence. In the next verse we get an intimation of *which* version, for, while the Latins hold the singular *σημειον* with **N** and majority Greeks and versions, **BDE<sup>s</sup>X<sup>b</sup>** only, with *a arm syr hier* and **BOH** only, have the plural *σημεια*.†

† There is great danger of **Δ** (*Sod*<sup>8</sup> 30 being quoted here instead of **Θ**<sup>s</sup>), for *Soden's* symbols read in verse 13 *H*<sup>8</sup> 1 014<sup>30</sup> and in verse 14 *H*<sup>8</sup> 1<sup>30</sup>. By 30 ε 30 is meant (**Θ**<sup>s</sup>) whereas *δ* 30 is **Δ**.

John

- vi. 22. *ειδον* BA *minn perpauc a d f l q* (following *turbæ*) *sah boh aeth syr W-H Sod txt* (*ιδου* LNW) [*pro ιδων ΓΔ<sup>στ</sup>Α unc<sup>9</sup>, et ειδεν ΝD<sup>στ</sup>X<sup>b</sup> b c ff g δ vg* (following *turba*) *σκοπιαζειν Nonn*]. This is again rather Egyptian. (*ιδοντες* 67 213, *ειδως Sod<sup>1110</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup>*.)
- but x. 12. *εστιν τα προβατα* NABLXW *Sod<sup>950</sup> min<sup>1110</sup> Const Eus Cyr W-H Sod txt* (for *εισιν τα προβατα*) but this is exceptional.
16. *γενησονται* (*pro γενησεται*) BDLXWΨ 1[*non fam*] 33 213 2<sup>pe</sup> *Sod<sup>183</sup> d f vg<sup>J</sup> goth sah boh arm Clem* (Variant *Chr codd inter εσεται et εσονται. Cf. verss*).
27. *ακουουσιν* (*pro ακουει*) following *τα προβατα* NBLXW *Sod<sup>950</sup> fam 13 33 157 213 249 397 Sod<sup>1110</sup> fam<sup>N</sup> d et latt Hom<sup>Clem</sup> ? Orig 4/6 Bas 1/4 Cyr W-H Sod txt* (*ακουσωσιν Paris<sup>97</sup>*) but against all the rest and D<sup>στ</sup> and *Clem Orig 2/6 Eus Bas 3/4 Thdt*.
- As showing that this must have been changed originally from *ακουει* we note that Ν alone follows with *αποληται* for *απολωνται*.
- xi. 45. δ (*pro â*) See under "Improvement."
- xvii. 7. *εισιν pro εστιν* (following *παντα οσα*) NBCLNXY *et WΨ 33 157 213 314 Sod<sup>1110</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> W-H Sod txt latt copt et d δ* [*contra D<sup>στ</sup> Δ<sup>στ</sup>*]. Cyril has *εστιν* against the Egyptian group.
- xx. 23. *τινος bis* (*pro τινων bis*) B (*sol inter gr*) *a e f syr Cypr Eus Orig<sup>int</sup> Aug Pacian Auct<sup>prom</sup> W-H<sup>ms</sup>*.

### Change of Case.

- viii. 55. This is quite an important place. *εσομαι ομοιος υμιν ψευστης* by BADW *fam 1 52 138 157 254 2<sup>pe</sup>* only of Greeks, and *latt: ero similis vobis mendax* (against *Tertullian's* genitive *ero similis VESTRI mendax*), instead of *εσομαι ομοιος υμων ψευστης*. Soden only adds 138 (*B & G add<sup>950</sup>*) to the Greek witnesses hitherto known and does not follow in his text, abandoning Hort's *υμιν*. The dative after *ομοιος* is as legitimate in Greek as the genitive, and throughout the N.T. is generally used. Therefore in opposing Ν and the mass here (including Ψ 892 and Paris<sup>97</sup>) B must be seeking for something. What was he doing? Who is right? Which is the harder reading? Was B influenced by the Latin, or did the Latins have *υμιν* and not *υμων* before them? Well *υμων* being the harder reading is I think distinctly to be preferred, and *υμιν* to be relegated to the large scrap-heap of attempted "improvements." St. John himself near by (ix. 9) says *ομοιος αυτω* and in 1 John iii. 2 we find *ομοιοι αυτω*. But if St. John uses the *genitive υμων* in the fourth Gospel at viii. 55 why not let it stand?

John

Our Lord was saying to the Jewish crowd: "And ye have not known Him, but I know Him, and if I should say that I do not know Him, I should be *like a liar among you*," or, *like a liar of your sort*, rather than "like to you a liar." In other words the genitive seems to convey that sarcasm† which not

† Dr. Burkitt ('The Gospel History') has this to say about the fourth Gospel: "There is an argumentativeness, a tendency to mystification, about the utterances of the Johannine Christ which, taken as the report of actual words spoken, is *positively repellent*" (p. 227). And again: "For we have not done with the Fourth Gospel when we have made up our minds that neither the narrative nor the discourses are to be regarded as history, as matters of the past fact" (p. 229). And again: "Especially am I sure that we shall never do justice to this Gospel, so long as we treat it as a narrative of events that were seen and heard of men. It is not a competitor of the Synoptic Gospels. But, you will say, what becomes of the truth of the Gospel?" (p. 235/6). And once more: "Then again, as I have already observed, the actual words which the Evangelist ascribes to our Lord when the Jews 'persecute' Him for healing on the Sabbath were calculated rather to exasperate than either to appease or instruct them" (p. 238). And lastly: "Now, if we look at the form and manner of these words, it is, I am convinced, impossible for one moment to imagine that they can represent an accurate account of any man's defence of himself after outraging the religious susceptibilities of powerful adversaries. It is not in the least the kind of thing which a phonograph would have reported" (p. 238/9).

But surely the other Gospellists have something of the same kind to say of Christ's manner on certain occasions! And as to deep sarcasm how about *Luke* xvi. 9 "And I say unto you Make to yourselves friends (out) of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when ye fail they may receive you into everlasting habitations"? No satisfactory interpretation of these words has ever been made, save that they convey a biting satire.

In the above quotations from Dr. Burkitt's book (chapter on the Fourth Gospel) I do not wish to do him any injustice by quotations perforce divorced from their context. He has said, rather unnecessarily, of me that I do not know the difference between a dilettante and a scholar. However that may be, I think I can detect the difference between an unbeliever and a believer! For in all Dr. Burkitt's writings he distinctly disavows his belief in our Lord's saying, recorded in the Fourth Gospel (xvi. 26): "But the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things and bring to your remembrance (*lit.* remind you of) all the things which (*πάντα ἃ*) I said unto you." In the face of this Burkitt writes again and again such things as this: "It was necessary that the disciples should reverence and love their Master; far more necessary that they should remember His phrases. *But the conditions were not specially favourable for accurate reminiscence*" (*op. cit.* p. 145). "I imagine it to be one of the most delicate of the problems which confront the investigator of the Gospel History to determine how far the sayings of Jesus reported only in the Gospel according to Matthew are, in the narrower sense, historical; how far, that is, they are a literal translation into Greek of words which Jesus once spoke... It is not only a question whether this or that sentence or illustration comes really from a later time" (p. 191/2). "If the picture presented in S. Mark's Gospel be in all essentials true, it will give an essentially reasonable account of the ministry. I do not mean it will contain no stories of what are called 'miracles' or that we should at once be able without misgiving to accept every incident as having actually occurred in the way related" (p. 66). "I have said that our Evangelists altered freely the earlier sources which they used. They changed, added, omitted. This sounds, no doubt, very terrible and dangerous. Let us put the statement then in another form, a form quite as legitimate, but less shocking. Let us say that the Evangelists were historians and not chroniclers. *This does not assert that they were trustworthy or even truthful*" (p. 21).



unoften underlies our Lord's addresses to those who were baiting him and lying in wait to "catch him in a word." The original Aramaic of John viii. 55 we can only surmise, but the Syriac is plain, not "like you a liar," but "a liar like you" "*mendax sicut vos.*" Malan says: "I am for myself a liar like you," and adds in a note: "the construction is

But for cold, calculated apostasy, note the following:

"That the Gospel according to Mark contained the story of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ is surely no reason for questioning its right to rank as an historical document... There is no doubt that the Church of the Apostles believed in the resurrection of their Lord. *They may have been mistaken*, but 'there is satisfactory evidence that many professing to be original witnesses'—I will not say, with Paley, 'of the Christian miracles': that claims too much, but certainly that Jesus had been raised from the dead—'passed their lives in labours...' " "Let us add, what Paley omitted, the abiding personal influence of Jesus in the memories of the first disciples, and let us concede that like all other men they may have been mistaken: with these amendments, Paley's famous allegation still stands. Yet no considerations of this kind explain the vitality of the Christian religion: *we do not know why it lived and lives, any more than we know why we ourselves are alive*" (p. 74/75).

Into this last sentence, in my opinion, is compressed a whole world of base denial of the great foundation of the Christian religion, and of its founder, whom the writer calls "our Lord." The Christian religion lives because, apart from cold historicity, the Spirit of God still moves upon the waters of men's hearts and convinces (the original reads the future *ἐλέγξει*) them "of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment," as the Founder promised when He said it was necessary for Him to go away from them, but that He would send the Paraclete to replace Him (John xvi. 7/14).

Dr. Burkitt, with many others, does not believe in the xi<sup>th</sup> chapter of St. John although it is attested by all documents, and in no uncertain manner, for textual differences there (quite unlike those of the pericope de adult.), are exceedingly small in number and very moderate in scope. "For all its dramatic setting it is, I am persuaded, impossible to regard the story of the raising of Lazarus as a narrative of historical events" (p. 228). This, because "there is no room" for it (p. 222) in St. Mark's narrative. But upon the same grounds of criticism, both "lower" and "higher," we must excise the long and most detailed ix<sup>th</sup> chapter concerning the definite healing of the man born blind about whom there was such a stir. And these excisions must logically be followed by the suppression of the xi<sup>th</sup> chapter to the Hebrews concerning *Faith*. The result will be "shipwreck," as St. Paul graphically foretold in the first chapter (*ver* 19) of the 1st Epistle to Timothy, following it up in the 2nd Epistle (ch. iii. 1/5) by his warning as to the character of the "heady" leaders of the last times (*προφανεῖς*, "headlong, rash"), "wrapped in smoke and mist of conceit and folly" (*τερυφωμένοι*), "having a form of godliness, but having denied (so *R.V.*; *Gr.* *ἡρημένοι*) the power thereof."

I said to such an one recently in Germany: "But, my dear sir, the trouble with these people is that if the good God himself came down and told them that the xi<sup>th</sup> chapter of St. John were absolutely true, they would not believe Him." His answer was "*Neither would I!*"

Does not this justify St. Paul's prophetic "*προφανεῖς, τερυφωμένοι..., ἔχοντες μόρφωσιν εὐσεβείας, τὴν δὲ δύναμιν αὐτῆς ἡρημένοι*"?

As regards the lower criticism I would like to add that in the xi<sup>th</sup> chapter of St. John there are few textual alterations, far fewer than in the succeeding chapters, and if on lower grounds the xi<sup>th</sup> chapter should have to be ejected, then the whole Gospel would have to go.

John

remarkable." The German version is very explicit: "So würde ich ein Lügner gleichwie Ihr seid." *Tertullian* seems here to be a star-witness against the Latinism of B.

B and the few are therefore accused here with Hort of following Latin, or of making a false grammatical improvement to the basic text. The Oxford edition of 1910 (without footnote) changes Hort's *υμιν* back to *υμων*, avoiding B's "sunstroke." I call it a "sunstroke," for observe that besides the opposition of *Ν* and the rest, the new Egyptian ms T<sup>1</sup> (so friendly otherwise) also has *υμων* against B.

- xvii. 11. *πατηρ αγιε* sic (pro *πατερ αγιε*) BN soli vid  
 21. *συ πατηρ* (pro *συ πατερ*) BDNW against the rest and against *Clem.* (*πατερ συ* Sod<sup>122</sup>, — *πατερ diatess*, illeg. syr sin.)  
 24. *πατηρ* (pro *πατερ*) BAN only here  
 25. *πατηρ δικαιε* sic BAN (*δικαιαι*) only here } against *Clem.*

xviii. 16. We now come to rather a peculiar case:

*εξηλθεν ουν ο μαθητης ο αλλος ο γνωστος του αρχιερεως* BC\*L 213 (and no others except X Paris<sup>97</sup> *ος ην γνωστος του αρχιερεως*) instead of . . . *ος ην γνωστος τω αρχιερει* of all others and *ΝW*. [*Ν* exceptionally *εξηλθεν ουν ο μαθ. εκινος' ος ην γνωριμος τω αρχιερει*.] The genitive does not seem to be a version influence, and yet, if correct, implies a change by all other authorities! (*Boh* can be read either way.)

Besides occurring here (and in verse 15 just before: *ην γνωστος τω αρχιερει*, where the dative is constant in all mss) *γνωστος* does not occur elsewhere in St. John nor in the other Gospels, except at *Luke* ii. 44 (*και τοις γνωστοις*), xxiii. 49 (*παντες οι γνωστοι*) both times in the plural, but it occurs ten times in *Acts* and everywhere with the dative, except at iv. 16 where it is used purely as an adjective (*γνωστον σημειον γεγνε* *δι' αυτων*) and at ix. 42 where no case follows (*γνωστον δε εγενετο καθ ολης της Ιοππης*), so that St. Luke does not use the genitive. We have to turn to the single other remaining occurrence of the word in the N.T. to find the genitive. I refer to St. Paul's use of the word at *Rom.* i. 19: *διοτι το γνωστον του θεου φανερον εστιν εν αυτοις*. Cf. Moulton's Winer, p. 295.

In the case we are discussing in St. John BCL seem to stand absolutely alone with *Westcott and Hort* (no alternative in the margin) and *Soden* (adding 213 = his<sup>129</sup>) although *Cyril* definitely opposes them with the mass. Why should *Cyril* tell us what to read, or rather what to omit at *Luke* xxiii. 34, and be denied a hearing here? In the very next verse *W-H* accept *Cyril's* testimony when backing the same mss BCLX for the unusual order *λεγει ουν τω Πιτρω η παιδισκη η θυρωρος*.

John

The science in such matters is evidently incomplete, for the Revisers disagree with Hort in both places! They agree with Cyril for the dative after γνωστος and disallow the above order.

- †xix. 31. ἦν γὰρ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκεῖνη τοῦ σαββατοῦ (*pro . . . ἐκεῖνου τοῦ σαββατοῦ*) B\*H 33 69† [*non fam sed diserte τοῦ σαββατοῦ ἐκεῖνη*] 138 157 247 317 6<sup>pe</sup> p<sup>scr</sup> i<sup>scr</sup> z<sup>scr</sup> *al. aliq Sod<sup>aliqua</sup> et Elz<sup>ed</sup> c f g gat vgg (instante > illa dies vg<sup>D</sup>) pers arab Cyr.*

The versions and it<sup>pl</sup> favour ἐκεῖνου, but *pers* and *arab* go with B\* for ἐκεῖνη and *syr pesh* (*sin* still missing) has a forceful repetition “*Dies enim erat magnus dies Sabbathi illius*” as rendered by Schaaf and Gwilliam, but Malan prefers to render “For it was a great day that day of Sabbath” (ΔΟΙ comes last in the sentence). Hort only places ἐκεῖνη in his margin, but Cyril proves that B\* was the correct Alexandrian reading. While *pers* (in the absence of *syr sin*) reads more simply than *syr pesh*, for *pers* = “for that day was great” (Malan<sup>int</sup>), “et ille dies magnus esset” (Walt<sup>int</sup>), and I think may represent *syr sin*.

### Change of Person.

- xx. 18. οτι εωρακα (*pro οτι εωρακεν*) NBNXW Laura<sup>A 104</sup> *a g gat aur vg sah boh aeth syr sin (εωρακαμεν S 33 [cf. Luc xxiv. 11], but all others and syrr rell Cyr οτι εωρακεν).*

εωρακα with οτι is strange and of course the more difficult reading. Hort spaces: μαθηταῖς ὅτι Ἐώρακα τὸν κύριον. καὶ ταῦτα, but does not intimate a various reading in his margin. There is no particular objection to the receiving of this rather strange lection. I would only remark that whereas in coptic XE AINAT is legitimate, the οτι in Greek and Latin is rather illegitimate [*b c d e ff § have quod vidit, f g r: quia vidisset, only a g vg: quia vidi*] and in view of our other coptic sympathies [see under that heading] NBNXW very likely imbibed the coptic and do not represent a “neutral” base at all! Even *syr sin* is not free from the reflex action of the coptic versions. Soden brings forward Laura<sup>A 104</sup> as the only new witness, but does not adopt εωρακα in his text. I notice that Amélineau’s *Evst* (p. 62) has εωρακαμε (with S 33).

† In Tischendorf’s apparatus B is not properly quoted. Gregory rectifies the matter in his *Emendanda*. B\* reads ἐκεῖνη. B<sup>2</sup> or B<sup>3</sup> ἐκεῖνου.

‡ τοῦ σαββατοῦ ἐκεῖνου D<sup>ms</sup> LN\* 78 t<sup>ms</sup> Paris<sup>57</sup> Sod<sup>532</sup>.

§ *ff* is misrepresented by Tisch and Horner for *vidi*.

*Change of Possessive Pronoun.*

John

- xii. 28. μου (*pro σου*) See under "Hopelessness of considering B neutral."

*Genitive Absolute.*

As in St. Luke's Gospel so in St. John's there is a marked absence of any dative absolute. In fact there is no trace of it if we except xx. 19 where *τη ημερα εκεινη τη μια (των) σαββατων* (interposed between two genitive absolutes) might be considered as one, with *ουση* understood.

The genitive absolute itself is quite rare, other expressions replacing it on countless occasions. Thus, whereas at xx. 19 we find *ουσης ουν οψιας, τη ημερα εκεινη τη μια (των) σαββατων, και των θυρων κεκλεισμενων* . . ., if we turn to vi. 16 we read *ως δε οψια εγενετο*, and at vii. 10 *ως δε ανεβησαν οι αδελφοι αυτου*. Or ii. 23 *ως δε ην εν (τοις) Ιεροσολυμοις εν τω πασχα*, or iv. 28 *αφηκεν ουν την υδριαν αυτης η γυνη, και απηλθεν* . . ., where we might expect to find genitive absolutes. The same applies to ix. 11, xi. 43, xii. 3 14, xiii. 4, xvii. 1, xviii. 1 18 38, xix. 1 and other places. Real genitive absolutes are observed and appear to be limited to the following places:

John

- iv. 9. *ουσης γυναικος Σαμαρειτιδος* (or > *γυν. Σαμ. ουσης*)  
 51. *ηδη δε αυτου καταβαινοντος*  
 vi. 23. *ευχαριστησαντος του Κυριου*  
 vii. 14. *ηδη δε της εορτης μεσουσης*  
 viii. 30. *ταυτα αυτου λαλουντος* †  
 xii. 37. *τοσαυτα δε αυτου σημεια πεποιηκοτος εμπροσθεν αυτων*  
 xiii. 2. *και δειπνου γενομενου*  
*ibid.* *του διαβολου ηδη βεβληκοτος* . . .  
 but not in xiii. 4 as might be expected.

Then none until:

- xviii. 22. *ταυτα δε αυτου ειποντος*  
 xx. 1. *σκοτιας ετι ουσης*  
 19. *ουσης ουν οψιας*  
*ibid.* *και των θυρων κεκλεισμενων*  
 again:  
 xx. 26. *των θυρων κεκλεισμενων*  
 xxi. 4. *πρωιας δε ηδη γενομενης*  
 11. *και τοσουτων οντων* ‡

† Instead of as at xi. 48, *ετι*, και ταυτα ειπων.

‡ Add vi. 23. For *αλλα ηλθον πλοιαρια*, *Ν* reads *επελθοντων ουν των πλοιων* and D (cf. *δ r syr cu*) *αλλων πλοιαιρων ελθοντων* [but *alīae naviculae venerunt*].

Now the same remarks apply here as those which I made under this head in St. Luke. The supposed "Antioch" revision has made no changes in St. John or in St. Luke from genitive to dative absolute. Then why should Lucian (or another) be accused of doing so in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark? Instead, does not the plain fact of the case stare us in the face that it was "Alexandria" which disapproved of certain dative absolutes in Matthew and in Mark and replaced them in *their* revising process by genitive absolutes? The case, it seems to me, is proven.

*Genitive before the Noun.*

Referring to iv. 16 (see remarks under "Compound verb for simple") we find a number of cases in this Gospel, as at:

John

- ii. 15. *και των κολλυβιστων εξεχεε το κερμα (τα κερματα BLTWX)*  
 xvi. 6. *η λυπη πεπληρωκεν υμων την καρδιαν*  
 xvii. 6. *σου το ονομα*  
 xviii. 37. *μου της φωνης*  
     where all mss are practically agreed. And as below where the  
     mss are not in exact agreement:  
 xiv. 30. *ο του κοσμου (τουτου) αρχων* Most, but:  
     *ο αρχων του κοσμου (τουτου)* 1 *fam* 13 138 2<sup>nd</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> *e vg*  
     *Hipp Orig Bas Ath Cyr.*  
 xv. 10. *καθως εγω τας εντολας του πατρος μου τετηρηκα* Most and  
     *Cyr*, but:  
     *καθως καγω του πατρος (μου) τας εντολας τετηρηκα* **NB** *a b ff*  
     *g vg Chr Novat.*  
 xviii. 10. *τον του αρχιερεως δουλον* the usual Greek construction as  
     exhibited by most (pontificis servum *g q δ vg*), but:  
     *τον δουλον του αρχιερεως* **ND** 242 *Sod*<sup>1444 & 362</sup> *a b c e f*  
     *ff r*  
 xix. 20. *οτι εγγυς ην ο τοπος της πολεως* Most, but:  
     *οτι εγγυς ην της πολεως ο τοπος* *tzt recept* and *W* 1 13 138  
     Paris<sup>97</sup> *al. it<sup>pl</sup> vg copt syr arm.*  
 24. *μου τα ιματια* **N<sup>sol</sup>** *cum copt* (— *μου* 127)  
 34. *αυτου την πλευραν* Nearly all Greeks with *copt*, but *Orig<sup>bis</sup>*  
     with 69–346 [non 13–124] 317 348 397 Paris<sup>97</sup> and the Latins  
     and Syriacs have *την πλευραν αυτου*. [*Eus* doubtless read the  
     former order, for he writes *του αμνου του θεου λογχη την*  
     *πλευραν ενυξε.*]  
 35. *αυτου εστιν η μαρτυρια* **NBW plur Orig<sup>bis</sup>**  
     *εστιν αυτου η μαρτυρια* **EGKNSUA** *min<sup>30+</sup>*, but:  
     *εστιν η μαρτυρια αυτου* **HY** 1 *min<sup>60</sup> latt<sup>pl</sup> Chr Cyr*

John

xx. 25. > μου τον δακτυλον **NDLW** 33 *Eust*<sup>Amélieu</sup> p. 62 *copt* (om. μου d)

*ibid.* > μου την χειρα **NL** 33 *Eust*<sup>Amélieu</sup> } *copt* { against την χειρα  
 > μου την χειραν **BW** } μου *rell et Cyr*  
 > μου τας χειρας **D** (om. μου d) } (- μου 1 a)

N.B.—*Soden* adopts μου την χειρα with **NL** 33 *Eust*<sup>Amélieu</sup> (**BW**) *copt*, but rejects μου τον δακτυλον of **NDLW** 33 *Eust*<sup>Amélieu</sup> *copt*! (*Paris*<sup>97</sup> ceases at xx. 15 and is not available here.)

xxi. 24. > αυτου η μαρτυρια εστιν **BCW**  
 > εστιν αυτου η μαρτυρια **D** *Eust* 48 d *aur Cyr*  
 > αυτου εστιν η μαρτυρια 33 ?  
 but **N** and the rest > εστιν η μαρτυρια αυτου as *latt* [*praeter d aur*].

### Matters of Order.

ii. 17. See under "Solecisms."

iv. 9. αιτεις > γυναικος Σαμαριτιδος ουσης **NABC\*LNT**<sup>b</sup> et **WΨ**  
*frag gr-copt Crum-Ken et 33 Cyr.*

against αιτεις ουσης γυναικος Σαμ. the rest and cursives and *Paris*<sup>97</sup>.  
 (*D d arm* omit ουσης.)

This is either an Egyptian improvement, for there would be no good reason to set ουσης back in any "Antiochian" revision, or the basic text like that of *D d arm* lacked this ουσης, which found its way into the text in differing positions. The versions—*copt syr lat*—express it in the position opposed to the Greek of **NAB** etc.

21. > πιστ. μοι γυναι **NBC\*L** et **WΨ** 71 213 253 259 892 [*non Paris*<sup>97</sup>] 6<sup>pe</sup> 7<sup>pe</sup> 8<sup>pe</sup> 11<sup>pe</sup> *vid Sod*<sup>193</sup> 1094 b l q *sah aeth syr hier Orig Ath Cyr W-H et Sod txt.* (- γυναι **F** 124<sup>1st</sup> *Sod*<sup>1268</sup>.)

against γυναι πιστ. μοι **D** the rest, d and other Latins, *boh, syr rell et cu sin, arm Thdt.*

Here, the coptics being divided, we do not place it under the heading of "Coptic."

vi. 17. > προς αυτους εληλυθει ο ιησους **BNΨ** 435 *Paris*<sup>97</sup> *sol vid.*,  
 against εληλυθει (+ ο **D**) ιησους προς αυτους **ND** 80 a d *aeth syr hier*,  
 and εληλυθει προς αυτους ο ιησους most and *boh syr (sah ιησους ηλθεν πρ. αυτους).*

*Soden* gives one new witness agreeing with **BNΨ** 435 *Paris*<sup>97</sup>, viz., *Sod*<sup>7541</sup>, a MS at Patmos, but adopts the ordinary reading in his text. Curiously enough *W-H* refuse the **BNΨ** reading in both text and margin, their text agreeing with the majority of witnesses, and their margin agreeing with **ND**.

49. > εφαγον εν τη ερημω το μαννα **BC(D)TW** b c d e ff *gat vgg*<sup>tere omn</sup> *Eus Chr Aug W-H Sod txt (Orig and aur\* εν τη*

John

ερημω εφαγον το μαννα) against **N** the rest coptics and *Cyr* *Thdt* for εφαγον το μαννα εν τη ερημω.

[vi. 49/50. τον ουρανιον αρτον φαγοντες απεθανον *Clem*<sup>Theodot</sup>]

- vii. 12. **N** reads: και γογγυσμος πολυς ην περι αυτου, while **BLTXW** a few cursives and *W-H* read: και γογγυσμος περι αυτου ην πολυς, bringing πολυς last. As far as I can see, both *Tischendorf* and *Soden* make a composition of these readings and print: και γογγυσμος ην περι αυτου πολυς which I do not think has any ms authority whatever except that of 33 and *Chrysostom* (codd. μ. ε. 7. 4. λ. θ. of *Matthaei*), the majority reading: και γογγυσμος πολυς περι αυτου ην, and 127 exceptionally: και γογγυσμος ην πολυς περι αυτου, while **l** and *goth* omit περι αυτου, and the "neutral" text probably lurks in *D a c d e ff l aur arm?* which omit πολυς altogether! The fact is that πολυς is probably an addition, injected into the text in differing positions. *Syr* and *pers* place it early with the majority, against the small Egyptian coterie of Greek mss (+ *b q*) followed by *Hort*.
33. > χρονον μικρον **NBLTWX** *Sod*<sup>850</sup> *fam* 13 *e ff q aur W-H* *Sod txt* (for μικρον χρονον *D* and the rest and *sah boh Cyr*) is possibly due to basic omission of χρονον which occurs in *syr sin*.
42. > οπου ην Δαυειδ ερχεται ο Χριστος **BLTWΨ** 33 *Laura*<sup>A 104</sup> [*non* 892 *non Paris*<sup>91</sup>] *c vg syr Cyr W-H Sod txt*. This instead of οπου ην Δαυειδ, ο Χριστος ερχεται, evidently to avoid the two nominatives coming together. In *sah* the verse is practically inverted, bringing ο Χριστος ερχεται (but maintaining this order) very early in the sentence. Compare carefully all authorities here and a lesson may be learned. *Itala* is against **BLTWΨ**.
52. > οτι εκ της γαλιλαιας προφητης **BLNTXΨl** 892 *al. pauc.* *Orig Chr Cyr W-H Sod txt*, but against **NDW** and the great mass.
- viii. 14. > η μαρτυρια μου αληθης εστιν **BWl** 157 235 314 *Sod*<sup>1385</sup> *fam φε* *Eust* 60 *b sah arm Orig* 1/3 *Epiph Did W-H*<sup>me</sup> while *D<sup>sr</sup>* has αληθεινη μου εστιν η μαρτυρεια (*d verum est testimonium meum*) and the rest of the Greeks with *Orig* 2/3 *Cyr* followed by *Sod* and *W-H*<sup>xt</sup>: αληθης εστιν η μαρτυρια μου as *d* and the Latins.
- We should refer *B*'s reading probably to *sahidic* influence [*boh* is opposed]. The fact that *W* joins is somewhat significant of this and not necessarily of any "neutral" form, while as 157 is joined by the sister ms *Eust* 60 it is evidently real and basic with them. 314 is *Soden*<sup>C 12</sup> a commentary ms.
- 19 *fin.* και τον πατερα μου > αν ηδευτε (*pro . . . > ηδευτε αν*)

John

BLNTXWΨ 1 33 213 249 397 892 [*non* Paris<sup>97</sup>] Laura<sup>A 104</sup> Sod<sup>541 1110 1268</sup> *Eust* 49 *c r aur Orig*<sup>quinquies</sup>, *Cyr*<sup>ter</sup> [*sed alibi contra*] *W-H* Sod *txt*, but against **N** and all the rest (*D r<sup>ec</sup> d b e ff om. av*). This appears to be a distinct effort to avoid ending the verse with *av*. Why should all the rest force the hiatus in *ηδείτε av*? (*D* omits *av*.)

- viii. 23. *υμεις εκ του κοσμου τουτου εστε, εγω ουκ ειμι εκ του κοσμου τουτου* So **N** and nearly all, but *BT* (*fam* 13 Sod<sup>190</sup>) *latt Orig* 1/3 *Cyr*<sup>txt</sup> wish to vary the "pair" of expressions, so they write: *υμεις εκ τουτου του κοσμου, εγω ουκ ειμι εκ του κοσμου τουτου*.

The only other authority to make a change† is the notable ms *W* with its well known coptic affinity (it has rested for 1500 years in Egypt), which places the demonstrative *before κοσμου* in BOTH places as does *sahidic* (and *boh* **πικοςμωc**†... **παικοςμωc**). The *lat* and *vg* object also to such an abject "pair" and so reverse the process thus: "de mundo hoc... de hoc mundo."

- ix. 17. > *τι συ (pro συ τι)* **NBLXΨ** [*teste Sod, non Lake*] *solī et boh* [*non sah*] *Cyr* followed by *W-H* and *Soden*, against all the rest including *T'W*. (*Syr*: *συ τι λεγ. συ, τι λεγεις συ* Sod<sup>541</sup>). *Om. συ* Sod<sup>551</sup> *ff*.

18. > *οτι ην τυφλος και ανεβλεψεν (pro οτι τυφλος ην και ανεβλεψεν)* **NBLNT<sup>1</sup>W** Sod<sup>050</sup> 157 Paris<sup>97</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup> Sod<sup>1110 1114 1268</sup> *W-H* and *Sod txt* (*b*) *r boh* (**χε παροῑ ᾱβελλε πε**, whereas *sah* **χε νετ̄β̄λλε πε**). This is more important than it seems, for *D d l* omit the clause altogether, showing something out of the common, which 28 emphasises by substituting *εγεννηθη* for *ην* and eliding *και ανεβλεψεν* with *b* and *syr sin* alone, thus: "*οτι τυφλος εγεννηθη*." *b* has "*qui fuerat caecus*" without *et videbat*; and *r* has "*quoniam fuerat caecus et videbat*." *e* varies the missing *και ανεβλεψεν* by writing "*et recepit lumen*."§ No Latins apparently use *εγεννηθη*, but *aeth* always prompt to show us that these readings of 28 or others are *old*, conflates with: "*quia caecus NATUS fuisset et vidisset*."

Amid these variations possibly *D d l* are correct with total omission.

The *εγεννηθη* of 28 *aeth* may of course have crept in from verses 1, 2, 19, 32, 34.

† 69 has *εκ τουτου του κοσμου secundo loco* (*teste Scriv*) as 33 and *latt*.

† - *τουτου prim* as *Eust* 50 and a few.

§ Cf. the Georgian and Slavonic versions.



*(Interesting Passage as regards Diatess and Latins.)*

John

ix. 21. Concerning what the parents of the blind man actually said.  
 Ordinary Greek: *αυτος ηλικιαν εχει · αυτον ερωτησατε · αυτος περι αυτου*

(*vel εαυτου*) *λαλησει* ANΓΔΔ *unc<sup>8</sup> l q δ goth slav*  
*pers syr<sup>sch</sup> pesh diatess Ps-Ath*

*αυτον ερωτησατε · ηλικιαν εχει · αυτος (+ τα Ψ 157 min<sup>allq</sup>) περι*  
*αυτου (vel εαυτου) λαλησει* N<sup>c</sup>BD(*επερωτησατε*  
*cum Sod<sup>1110</sup>*) LXΨ 1 22 33 157 213 397 *Sod<sup>541 1110</sup>*  
*Paris<sup>97</sup> IT [except. b (vide infra) l q δ] vg boh aeth*  
*arm georg syr<sup>hl:r</sup> Cyr et F<sup>lat diatess</sup> W-H et Sod txt.*

but N<sup>c</sup>WT<sup>1</sup> *Sod<sup>1083 1260</sup> b sah (syr sin) Chr<sup>vid</sup> OMIT αυτον*  
*ερωτησατε, and sah further omits ηλικιαν εχει.*

*Syr sin* really merges *αυτον ερωτησατε · αυτος περι αυτου*  
*λαλησει* by saying: "from him ye can know." In reality  
 the omission should be considered to be of the final clause  
*αυτος περι αυτου λαλησει* (with *l*), which gives us the  
 variation: *ιδου ηλικιαν εχει · απ αυτου δυνατε μαθειν syr*  
*sin (l).*

We have the *itala* opposing the *diatess*. Here it may well be that  
*diatess* is conformed to *syr pesh*, for *syr sin* (*hiat syr cu*) opposes both  
 with a different turn of phrase. But thus it precedes *diatess* for N<sup>c</sup> and  
*b*, that interesting conjunction, omits one of the two clauses whose order  
 is *sub judice*. N<sup>c</sup>T<sup>1</sup>W and *b* omit "ask him."

"He is of age" therefore stands in all except *sah* (12 mss!) which  
 practically omits both *ηλικιαν εχει* and *αυτον ερωτησατε*, saying "...He  
 also, he was fit for to speak about himself," retaining the *αυτος* which  
 NBDLX 1 33 *it aeth* omit, and perhaps covering in intent *ηλικιαν εχει*.

"Ask him," therefore, is the point around which it all turns. The  
 inversion of order shows that something was wrong in an old common  
 parent. This may account for omission in N<sup>c</sup>T<sup>1</sup>W *b syr sin sah Chr<sup>vid</sup>*, or  
 it may be basic. The fact however that all other Latins have it militates  
 against it. On the whole it looks like the old question of an exemplar  
 which had been (properly) corrected in the margin, and led to confusion  
 in the minds of the copyists.

There is no trace of trouble left in F<sup>lat diatess</sup> which agrees with the *it*  
 and N<sup>c</sup>BDLXΨ in the order *αυτον ep. ηλικιαν εχει etc.*, but thus opposes  
*diatess arab.*

John

ix. 24. See under "Coptic" and "Latin."

31. *οιδαμεν οτι > ο θεος αμαρτωλων < ουκ ακουει* BDT<sup>1</sup>ΔΨ [*negl.*  
*Ψ Sod*] *a d e goth Cypr Conc<sup>Carth</sup> a d e W-H txt (nil mg)*

John

[*sah boh* θεος ουκ ακουει αμαρτωλων (*αμαρτωλου sah†*); *syr pesh* θεος φωνην αμαρτωλων ουκ ακουει (*mut syr sin*); cf. *aeth*]. This instead of *οιδαμεν οτι > αμαρτωλων ο θεος < ουκ ακουει* which **NW** with the rest as well as 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> and most Latins give us, as also *Cyr Orig*<sup>int</sup> and *Hil* and *Sod*<sup>txt</sup>. (*Chr* is on both sides.) The change of order seems to be a clear "improvement" by **BDAΨ**. The harder order (supported as it is by the mass of Latins) is undoubtedly right. The combination **BDT**<sup>ii</sup> is of no weight in such places, given their record otherwise, when **NW** and the mass oppose. (*N aeth gat* = *οιδαμεν δε οτι > αμαρτωλων ουκ ακουει ο θεος.*)

x. 16, 17. See under "Latin."

28. " " "Coptic."

32. " " "Solecisms" in the first place, and "Latin" in the second place.

42. " " "Latin and Coptic."

xi. 47. > οτι ουτος ο ανθρωπος πολλα ποιει σημεια **NABLMWXΨ**  
*Sod*<sup>750 1089</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> *sah Orig Ath W-H et Sod txt.*

οτι ο ανθρωπος ουτος πολλα ποιει σημεια 33 *et Ψ [Sod, non Lake]*

οτι ο ανθρωπος ουτος πολλα σημεια ποιει *Λ Sod*<sup>1290 1054 1194 3371</sup>

οτι ουτος ο ανθρωπος πολλα σημεια ποιει *Unc*<sup>10</sup> *al. pl etc. Chr*

οτι ο ανθρωπος ουτος σημεια πολλα ποιει *Cyr (Sod*<sup>1250</sup>)

ουτος ο ανθρωπος τοιαυτα σημεια ποιει *D b c d e ff*

πολλα τα σημεια α ουτος ο ανθρ. ποιει *boh*

οτι ουτος ο ανθρωπος ποιει πολλα σημεια *sah*

xii. 18. *δια τουτο και υπηνητησεν αυτω ο οχλος οτι...* So write most authorities. (Some omit *και*.) But **B** writes *alone*

> *δια τουτο υπηνητησεν αυτω και ο οχλος, οτι...* Now observe

*sah: ΕΤΒΕ ΠΑΙ ΟΝ Α ΠΛΗΚΨΕ ΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΗΤΨ ΧΕ.*

*Sah* does not therefore omit *και* as Tischendorf says, but

places it ("ΟΝ") before *ο οχλος*, as does **B**, merely displacing

*υπηνητησεν* and giving it after *ο οχλος*. Surely a sight of *sah*

here influenced **B** so to write, unless he added *και* in the

wrong place, from his margin. But see *boh* omitting the

prior *και*. Hort does not record **B** here in his margin. Why

not?

xiii. 9. See under "Solecisms."

10. " " "Latin."

19. > *να πιστευσητε (πιστευητε BC Orig 3/5 W-H txt [nil mg])*  
*οταν (εαν Paris*<sup>97</sup>) *γενηται οτι εγω ειμι NBIL 213 Paris*<sup>97</sup> some  
latins *sah Orig 3/5 W-H Sod txt.*

This instead of *να οταν γενηται πιστ. οτι εγω ειμι* of the rest and *Orig 2/5*. It is a very difficult matter to judge who is

† Some cursives and **EUXΓ** have *αμαρτωλον*, as *Cypr peccatorem*.

John

right, and *Origen* insists upon being upon both sides as so often. I only mention it for this reason and to show how impossible it is to reconstruct an "*Origen*" text seeing that he not only gives both *orders*, but writes *επαν* [observe Paris<sup>97</sup> *εαν*] for *οταν* once,<sup>†</sup> and *πιστευητε* thrice against *πιστευσητε* twice.

- xiii. 21. > *υμιν λεγω* B<sup>sol</sup> *cum pers* (*ut solet*). See the same order at x. 1 and 7, noticed under "*Solecisms*," but not thus elsewhere.

36. See under "*Latin*."

- xiv. 16. *να μεθ υμων εις τον αιωνα η* B<sup>gr</sup> and *b* latin only and *W-H*<sup>ms</sup>. This among three varieties of order, and the exchange of *η* for *μενη*. Old Latin is for *η*, but the Vulgates all for *μενη*, and as they drew from a text similar to NB such as Paris<sup>97</sup> it is probable that *η* is an amendment, for Paris<sup>97</sup> has *μενη*. The differing order between B, N, D, and LQX is suspicious.

20. > *υμεις γνωσεσθε* BLM\*QX 33 213 *Sod*<sup>1110 1443 C<sup>60</sup></sup> *f vg Cyr* 1/6 *W-H* [*non Sod*] against *γνωσεσθε υμεις* NDW *rell minn omni vid et Paris*<sup>97</sup>. I would point out that as A *Sod*<sup>750</sup> 249 *Sod*<sup>N 31</sup> *Eust* 150<sup>asm</sup> *b dim em gat vg*<sup>v</sup> *syr pers aeth Chr Cyr* 5/6 *Victorin* omit *υμεις* altogether, the differing order between the large ND group, and the small B group may well have its source in an addition to the basic text from the margin. *υμεις* appears superfluous here.

- xv. 2. > *καρπον πλειονα* See under "*Latin*" and note specially in connection with xiv. 31.

9. > *υμας ηγαπησα*

See under "*Latin*."

10. > *του πατρος τας εντολας* (- *μου*)

B *a b c ff q aur Novat*  
*Chr*<sup>pl</sup> *W-H*<sup>txt</sup>.

xvi. 12. > *υμιν λεγειν*

See under "*Latin*."

23. > *δωσει υμιν εν τω ονομ. μου*

See under "*Coptic*."

- xviii. 2. > *οτι πολλakis συνηχθη ιησους μετα των μαθητων εκει* B<sup>sol</sup>.

This is rather interesting, because B clearly accuses himself of being non-neutral here in placing *εκει* right at the end, as an afterthought (incorporated from the margin? *Sod*<sup>178</sup>, with *syr pesh*<sup>uno</sup>, omits), and this is admitted by Hort, who places the B reading in his margin, and has in his text:

*οτι πολλakis συνηχθη Ιησους εκει μετα των μαθητων αυτου* as N and most, but D *d it*<sup>mult</sup> and some versions place *εκει* before (ο) *Ιησους*. The Latins vary a good deal, and Hort nearly always adopts B when there are several varieties of readings or of order. Here he recognises B as absolutely *non-neutral* in its unique order.

<sup>†</sup> Just as at xiii. 27 for *τοτε Orig* uses *ετα* four times, and omits (with NDL) thrice elsewhere.

John

*Soden* now adduces *Sod*<sup>173</sup> for omission of *εκει*, and supports B for *εκει* at the end with *Sod*<sup>337</sup>. [*εκει* is placed after *συνηχθη* by D Paris<sup>97</sup> *a r (vg)* and *syr.*]

Note that in the following verse, where *Ν* alone omits *εκει*, *syr sin* follows B's example in verse 2, and in verse 3 alone places *εκει* right at the end of the verse!

- xviii. 5. Another matter of order (unique, by B) promptly supervenes, and again *non-neutral*, and once more relegated to Hort's margin. It stands exactly on the same plane as the matter just noticed under xviii. 2 and is due to addition from the margin of B's parent. Here the *textus receptus* after "*τινα ζητειτε*" says: *απεκριθησαν αυτω, Ιησουν τον Ναζωραιον. Λεγει αυτοις ο Ιησους εγω ειμι.* *Ν* retains this, merely suppressing the article before *Ιησους*, but ACLX and the rest of the Greeks confirm the *text. recept.* *Sah* and *boh* say >*Ιησους αυτοις* but neither *Ν* nor B are following them. D 435 and five minuscules plus *Sod*<sup>641 1054</sup> with *b e r* [*hiat d*] *gat syr sin* and *Orig* [*Sod* omits *Orig*] OMIT *Ιησους* altogether. When B comes to the place he acts thus:

>*λεγει αυτοις εγω ειμι Ιησους* incorporating *Jesus* last, and changing the method of the address. No trace of this lingers in others except in the Vercelli Codex *a*, which has: *Dixit illis: Ego sum. Iesus autem stabat et Judas...*, thus preserving the order of B and incorporating *Jesus* in the next sentence. Consult the original page of B. We find *ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ ΙΘΕΙCΤΗΚΕΙ*, *ΙΘ* coming before *ιστηκει*. The combination D [*habet d<sup>an</sup>*] *mini<sup>7</sup> b e r syr sin Orig* is strong for the simple omission of *Jesus*, which is in fact what Hort adopts. Some of his principles here go to the winds in favour of others involving the "shorter text," but the fact remains that B is discredited as a "neutral" by adding in the wrong place. The combination D *b e r (hiat d) syr sin* is the true Latin base. The Oxford edition of 1910 goes back to the *textus receptus*! This is rather amusing, seeing that *syr sin*, discovered since Hort's day, lends its voice to the omission of the Latins which Hort followed here, and which justifies him. Poor B is left alone, all alone out in the cold. This is a sad "sunspot."

15. >*γνωστος ην (pro ην γνωστος)* BW 4 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>8469</sup> *a c f ff q r gat aur W-H<sup>ms</sup>*. Cf. *syr et boh*.  
 17. >*λεγει ουν τω Πετρω η παιδισκη η θυρωρος* BC<sup>\*</sup>LX 33 213 397 [*non al. gr.*] *b c f g r gat vg Cyr W-H & Sod txt* [*Hiat d e*].

See as to BCLX just previously under "Change of Case" where they oppose *Cyril*.

John

- xviii. 18. BCLX remain together here for another change of order with (Cyr) but have the additional support of NW and a few cursives with *a*.
22. >εἰς παρεστηκως των υπηρετων (pro εἰς των υπηρ. παρεστηκως A plur) N\*BW Sod<sup>641</sup> *a ff g gat vg Cyr W-H & Sod txt*, while N\*CLXYΨ 33 213 604 Laura<sup>A 104</sup> Sod<sup>1110</sup> *b c f r* vary in a third manner with εἰς των παρεστηκοτων (vel παρεστωτων) υπηρετων and Paris<sup>97</sup> εἰς των παρεστηκοτων των υπηρετων.
34. >η αλλοι ειπον σοι BC\*D<sup>sup</sup>LW [non Sod<sup>650</sup>] *sah boh syr Cyr vg<sup>edd</sup> W-H [non Sod]*.

This against the usual η αλλοι σοι ειπον of N and most as Sod<sup>121</sup>, or η αλλος σοι ειπεν of (M)NSH and a few, and η αλλοι σοι περι εμου ειπον J Sod<sup>1454</sup>.

38. See under "Latin."
- xix. 4. >ουδεμιαν αιτιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω B 1 33 73 Sod<sup>1349 1443 & 460</sup> *aeth vg<sup>G</sup> Cyr et W-H & Sod txt* (cf. largely differing orders in others.† *Sah* and *boh* grouped by Tisch here do not agree exactly).
11. Large variety of order here.
- 10, 11. Important. See under "Syriac."
12. Great variety. See under "Coptic and Latin."
20. See under "Coptic and Latin."
21. >βασιλευς των Ιουδαιων ειμι BLXΨ 33 314 Sod<sup>1110</sup> (*aeth*) [non W non Paris<sup>97</sup> non al. vid.] W-H [non Sod]. *ειμι* is omitted by *syr* and *vg<sup>B</sup>*. Possibly it was missing from the B<sup>ex</sup> exemplar and carried in from the margin.
28. See under "Latin."
33. >ηδη αυτον τεθυνηκοτα (pro αυτον ηδη τεθν.) BLW Orig W-H [non Sod]. (Tisch "∴ qui ordo corrigendus videbatur.") The mass with *Cyr* have αυτον ηδη τεθυνηκοτα, but *c ff q r vg<sup>T</sup> arm aeth georg (sax) Auct<sup>from</sup>* do not express ηδη. This may possibly be basic, owing to the differing order as between BLW Orig alone and all the rest (including all Soden's new witnesses) with *Cyril*. In St. John *r* of the Latins is quite important with a very old text. It is notable that the "Egyptian" Latins *c* and *ff* also omit, while *vg<sup>T</sup>* is as old as any of them in base. Is it the *Latins* who once again preserve the base?
- xx. 17. >μη απτου μου (pro μη μου απτου) B<sup>sol</sup> with Tert<sup>grax</sup> ("ne, inquit, contigeris me") and some versions as† *syr arm aeth copt*, but against every other Greek including the new Egyptian

† For further particulars see the 'Morgan Gospels,' pp. 382/333.

† But some exchange "touch me not" for "draw not near me."

John

Lectionary, Amélineau p. 63 [*Eust* 47 only omits *μου†*] against the Latins expressly *noli me tangere*, and against the host of Fathers *Iren<sup>int</sup> Resp<sup>orthod</sup> Orig<sup>sexles</sup> Orig<sup>int</sup> Eus<sup>octles</sup> Eustath Epiph<sup>bis</sup> Chr Cyr Thdt Sever al.*

B does not even substitute *μοι* (*Pindar*) for *μου*. Hort carries *μη απτου μου* religiously into his margin, but no one else considers it seriously and the Oxford edition of 1910 rejects it. Another "sunspot" I suppose. There are many recorded in these pages.

xxi. 17. > *παντα συ* (*pro συ παντα*) **NBC\*DNW** *Sod*<sup>50</sup> 33 [*non al. minn Sod*] *a d e f f m aur vg<sup>4</sup> syr W-H Sod txt.*

‡ 18. > *ζωσ. σε* (*pro σε ζωσ.*) **NBC<sup>2</sup> Cyr** [*non al. Sod*], *cf. copt (syr) [non lat] W-H Sod txt.*

22, 23. See under "Latin."

24. See "Genitive before the Noun."

*Hopelessness of considering B neutral, when he can never understand Christ's character.*

xii. 28. We have here to indict B on a frightful count. We indict him for mutilating scripture without the shadow of excuse, and this in a most important place. His changes of tense, or suppression of the article, or niceties of expressions by "pairs" are nothing to this. In the short expletive prayer of our Lord, introduced in verse 27 by the words *συ η ψυχη μου τεταρακται και τι ειπω*; our Lord continues: *πατερ σωσον με εκ της ωρας ταυτης* 'αλλα δια τουτο ηλθον εις την ωραν ταυτην. Πατερ δοξασον σου το ονομα.

The reply is reported swiftly in the words following: *ηλθεν ουν φωνη εκ του ουρανου* 'και εδοξασα και παλιν δοξασω without mentioning any "object." Therefore B was free to alter the record in the prayer itself, and he does so.

† *d<sup>scr</sup>* is wrongly quoted by *Tisch* for omission. It omits the second, not the first *μου*. *Soden* commits a bad blunder here, citing **N** and **D**, **W** and 348, "at" and *Orig* for the omission of this first *μου*. They all omit the second only (*post parepa prim.*) with the possible exception of 348 (*Sod*<sup>121</sup>) whose actual readings *Soden* is the first to report fully. *Soden* does not mention *d<sup>scr</sup>* here (his<sup>1896</sup>) and so does not repeat *Tischendorf's* error, but places it with the others for *-μου post parepa prim.* He neglects however the only *ms* which *does* omit outright, viz. *Eust* 47, as he makes a practice of avoiding the testimony of Lectionaries nearly everywhere. (*Eust* 47 is a most important document in every way and will bear the closest watching. Its absence from *von Soden's* apparatus is most regrettable. It is often alone with very ancient and important witnesses, e.g. at John ii. 19 with *Ignatius* alone.) *Matthaei* refers to *Origen*<sup>4, 196</sup> where he would seem to exclude *μου* with *Eust* 47.

‡ But B has *και αλλος ζωσει σε* alone, as *sah boh*, while **NC<sup>2</sup>** have *και αλλοι ζωσουσιν σε*, and *syrr* add to gird: 'thy loins.' Therefore B remains alone with certain versions (against the Latin).

John

B writes: Πατερ δοξασον μου το ονομα. He has the support of one minuscule (of which we rarely hear), viz. *Evan* 5 [neglected by *Soden*]. *Hort* and the *R.V.* do not exhibit a trace of this in their texts. In *Hort's* margin is found "*Ap.*" In the Appendix is found "xii. 28 τὸ ὄνομα] τὸν υἱὸν," nothing more. So we turn to vol. ii. 'Notes on Select Readings,' p. 89, col. 1. Here we find the variation *τον υιον* for *το ονομα* described as *Alexandrian*, but—would it be believed?—not having the grace or the face to refer to the B reading at all! Now whether we read with L[*negl. Sod.*]XX<sup>b</sup> and *Athanasius* πατερ δοξασον σου τον υιον, or with B πατερ δοξασον μου το ονομα [instead of πατερ δοξασον σου το ονομα] the result is the same, and we find this most *Alexandrian* reading in B (which we were told was absolutely free from such things). *Hort's* silence is not dignified. It is worse. For he has said that he could find no trace of any *Alexandrian* reading in B in any book of the New Testament. Therefore it is specious here to hide behind the view that *μου* for *σου* is a mere error. *Cyril* has said εἴτε δοξασον σου τον υιον ἔχει η γραφή, εἴτε δοξασον σου το ονομα, τουτον εστιν τη των θεωρηματων ακριβεια (xii. 28, xvii. 1), so that he brings together both readings. After the correct reading here: δοξασον σου το ονομα D adds εν τη δοξη η ειχον παρα σοι προ του τον κοσμον γενεσθαι which is a phrase erroneously brought back from John xvii. 5. D would therefore really like to read with B or *Alexandria*, for in xvii. 5 the previous clause reads και νυν δοξασον με συ, πατερ, (continuing) παρα σεαυτω τη δοξη η ειχον προ του τον κοσμον ειναι παρα σοι. [At xvii. 5 D has γενεσθαι τον κοσμον for τον κοσμον ειναι.]

We have here then a clear case of *Alexandrian* editing by B. Foolish editing too. Because, when our Lord quickly adds "But for this came I to the selfsame hour," he debars any thought of "Glorify me" or "Glorify my name" or "Glorify Thy Son," and the editors have properly accepted the wording of the prayer to be "Glorify Thy name," in Him if you will (as *Tert* once: glorifica nomen tuum in quo erat filius).

*μου* is not a mistake or a slip made by B. It is most deliberate. If it is wrong why did not *Hort* own up and say so? And as his silence says it is wrong how can such a text be "neutral"?

#### Harmonistic.

xiii. 26. + λαμβανει και (ante διδωσιν) BCLMX et N<sup>ca</sup> 33 213 892  
*Sod*<sup>183 351 1110</sup> aeth *Orig*<sup>ter</sup> W-H & *Sod* txt against NDWΨ

John

Paris<sup>97</sup> and the rest and the versions and *Cyr*. The opposition is so strong that this may have come from the λαβων in all three of the synoptics (Matt. xxvi. 26, Mark xiv. 22, Luke xxii. 19). In 1 Cor. xi. 23 it is ελαβεν.

- xix. 41. *ην τεθειμενος* (*pro ετεθη*) **NBW** Paris<sup>97</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup> *Cyr* but these only, miserable band of Alexandria contradicted by *Origen*. Cf. *positus erat latt* here, and cf. *Luc* xxiii. 53 *ην ουδεις ουδεπω κειμενος*. In fact Tischendorf says "*ex Luc* 23, 53" and refuses to displace *ετεθη* from his text. Bolder (and stupider) is Hort, who places *ην τεθειμενος* in his text *without marginal alternative*. The *R.V.* more wisely follows in Tischendorf's footsteps and retains *ετεθη* (but the Oxford edition of 1910 has no note on the evidence). Soden's text follows Hort and **NBW** Paris<sup>97</sup>. He adds Laura<sup>A 104</sup> to the small group.

*Example of Conflation exhibited only in this "Neutral" text of B.*

- vii. 39. *ουπω γαρ ην πνευμα* without addition by **NKTIΨ** Sod<sup>105</sup> 42: 91 280 <sup>w<sup>cr</sup></sup> (*boh sah*) *arm Orig<sup>quater</sup> Dion<sup>alex</sup> Cyr<sup>quater</sup> Hesych<sup>int</sup>* 1/3 *Rebapt Tisch & W-H txt.*

**LN**XW *unc<sup>9</sup> δ vg<sup>sex</sup> Did Ath Chr Thdt Orig<sup>int</sup> 1/3 Txt. rec. & Sod txt* add *αγιον*.

*Eus* and *a b c ff g l r aur gat vg<sup>pl</sup> syr pesh cu sin* add *δεδομενον*.

*D d f goth (aeth)* add *αγιον επ* (in *d f*) *αυτοις*.

But it is left for *B e† q syr hier Orig<sup>int</sup> 1/3* to conflate by adding *αγιον δεδομενον*. *B* has no Greek support † but 254 = *αγιον δοθεν*, which is distinctly a critical codex; its corrections being only used by the critics when they favour **N** or *B*.

Now the situation is quite clear here, and Hort recognised it by following **N** and the Fathers against *B*. What becomes of his "neutral" text in *B* then? This is worse than a "sunspot" or "sunstroke" as regards *B* [see Souter], for it is deliberate tampering with the deposit. Nor does Hort himself conduct his enquiry into this matter better than *B*. In the margin of his text opposite *πνευμα* (*tantum*) is found "*Ap.*" and we therefore turn to the Appendix (p. 574). But there we find no word about the misconduct of *B*. Instead we find this, and only this:

"vii. 39] *πνεῦμα*] + *δεδομένον*; also + *ἅγιον*: also + *ἁγιον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς*: also + *ἅγιον δεδομένον*."

† What does von Soden mean by citing *e* (before "*it<sup>exc</sup> q f*") for omission of *αγιον*? True, Hans von Soden's "African" text lacks it, but *e* reads: "*nondum autem sps erat sanctus datus*."

‡ Soden adds Δ<sup>4</sup> (= Σ<sup>b</sup>).



John

That is absolutely all. Not a word as to the culprit B who perpetrated the addition referred to lastly. In vol. i. p. 82 ('Notes on Select Readings') he goes into the matter a little more fully, but as usual cannot recognise what the readings mean. Under +*αγιον* he has "Pre-Syrian (? Alexandrian) and Syrian," under +*αγιον δεδομενον* he has no remarks. Well, of what family is it? I have said before that Dr. Hort could not recognise his own children when he saw them. I repeat the accusation here. And if he could not, how can his followers?

This is his illuminating remark on the subject:

"The singular distribution of documents is probably due in part to the facility with which either *αγιον* or *δεδομενον* or both might be introduced in different quarters independently. "Text" [*i.e.* '*πνευμα*'] "explains all the other readings, and "could not have been derived from any one of them." Thus he utterly condemns B here.

Well then B's usefulness is destroyed? Not a bit of it. Hort seizes the first opportunity to follow B again in the next verse +[*οτι*] where B with only D (against the rest and *Orig Cyr*) inserts this in the *coptic* method.

### General Improvement.

- i. 13. (omission). B and one cursive (17) omit the second clause *ουδε εκ θεληματος ανδρος*. This is either because of homoioteleuton,† or more likely because there seems something of tautology in "*ουδε εκ θεληματος σαρκος ουδε εκ θεληματος ανδρος*." But for B's bad record previously we would not select this against him. The omission is opposed by all else, by W 892 and Paris<sup>91</sup>, by all versions,‡ and by Tertullian and other Fathers, except *Athanasius* and *Eusebius*, who omit with B, and *Ath* appears deliberate. This is another *Alexandrian* reading as witnessed to by *Ath*, which is shared by B, and the existence of which Hort denied.
- ii. 15. *τα κερματα* (*pro το κερμα*). BLT<sup>b</sup>XW *Oxyr*<sup>247</sup> 33 213 314 Paris<sup>91</sup> *b q copt arm Orig*<sup>octiles</sup> *Eus W-H txt* [*nil in mg*] *Sod*<sup>ms</sup> against all others and *Nonnus*. This seems to be an effort at (mistaken) improvement, and has support of *Oxyr*<sup>247</sup> W

† E\* and a very few omit the first clause *ουδε εκ θελ. σαρκος*.

‡ *Sah* has it, but alone changes the beginning, writing "These were not out of the wish of blood and flesh, nor out of the wish of man," for *οι ουκ εξ αιματων ουδε εκ θεληματος σαρκος ουδε εκ θεληματος ανδρος*. If *sah* considered the matter we may be sure that B did, although B adopts a different plan.

John

and *copt* as well as *Origen* fully. Hence it is certainly Egyptian. As to the neighbouring places in the same verse, observe following, where **Σ** 157 and *Epiph.*, almost alone, have *κατεστρεψεν*, and most Greeks with *Origen* (over 1/2) *αυεστρεψεν*, BWXII<sup>2</sup> 61 108 234 247 251 252 435 q<sup>scr</sup> r<sup>scr</sup> (*Sod* only quotes 251) *Sod*<sup>1222</sup> **Σ** 11 16 go with *Cyr* and *Oxyr*<sup>847</sup> *W-H txt* for *αυεστρεψεν*. The Old Syriac only begins again at ii. 16, so we do not know if it employed singular or plural for *το κερμα* or for *εκ σχοινων*, but we may note that 33 and 71 *Sod*<sup>1349 1443</sup> *ff* and *q* use *εκ σχοινιου* alone here.

iii. 34. —ο θεος *sec.* **ΣBC\*LT<sup>b</sup>W** 1 33 213 2<sup>pe</sup> *Paris*<sup>97</sup> *b e f l Cyr* (*syr cu*) *W-H & Sod txt*, against all the rest and *syr copt aeth Orig et Orig<sup>int</sup> Chr Did Cyr<sup>hier</sup> Ang<sup>loh</sup>*. This seems to be an endeavour to remove redundancy.

iv. 51. (Indirect for dramatic direct oration). *λεγοντες οτι ο παις αυτου ζη* by **ΣABC** and *W* 185 *Sod*<sup>541</sup> *c d f ff g l r gat aur vg arm W-H & Sod txt* and the inevitable textual muddler *Origen* in the proportion of 1/3.

This is opposed by *D<sup>sr</sup> LΓΔΔΠ unc<sup>9</sup> minn omn rell (et N οτι ο υιος σου ζη) a b e q syr cu sin pesh hier sah boh aeth Chr Cyr* with direct oration, employing *σου* for *αυτου*. It is confirmed by *Orig*<sup>4.273</sup> (on the next page following the quotation *αυτου*<sup>4.272</sup>) plus *Origen (ex Heracl.<sup>4.275</sup>)*.

*Tisch* misquotes 13 for *σου*. In *Ferrar's* edition 13 reads: *ο παις σου ο υιος αυτου* (but the rest of the family *σου* with all other minuscules).

In a question of this kind when the Semitic versions are so strong for direct oration, the minuscules should be decisive. What is their verdict? *None uphold αυτου*.† Not even 892 nor *Paris*<sup>97</sup> nor 33 (the old "queen of cursives" before discovery of 892 and *Paris*<sup>97</sup>) nor 28 which here opposes and neutralises the testimony of *W*.

May I ask, if it is a question of revision, who would revise *back* to direct oration? The thing is unimaginable. If *αυτου* were original, the whole series of "Antioch" revisers (and they are represented by other Egyptian mss) could never have put back *σου* so successfully.

John

iv. 52. *ειπον ουν* **BCLNWΨ** 1 33 50 213 291 2<sup>pe</sup> *Sod*<sup>5409</sup> *Paris*<sup>97</sup> *W-H Sod txt* but no versions except *arm*. The others and *Cyril* have *και ειπον* with **Σ**, but *T<sup>n</sup> Sod*<sup>1222</sup> *e foss* with *sah boh* and the middle-Egyptian version, and the *syrr* omit the copula. The "neutral" text is therefore with *copt syr*, and the *ουν* of *BCL* is a sheer improvement.

53. Similarly *εκεινη τη ωρα εν η* by **NBCT<sup>n</sup>** 1 *minn alig*<sup>Sod</sup>

† *Soden* now adduces two critical codices for it, his<sup>541</sup> at Patmos, and his<sup>410</sup> = 185 at Florence.

John

*W-H & Sod txt* for *εν εκεινη τη ωρα εν η* should be compared to Latin, but it avoids a double *εν*.

- v. 29. A little "nicety" of B alone:

*οι τα αγαθα ποιησαντες εις αναστασιν ζωης οι (-δε) τα φανλα πραξαντες εις αναστασιν κρισεως.*

This is another of those "pairs" which B always gives his (Alexandrian?) attention to. No other Greeks support the omission of *δε*. *Soden* does not add one single witness to B. Not even the faithful 213 (*Sod*<sup>229</sup>). Nor do Ψ 892 or Paris<sup>97</sup> add their voice for omission. W indeed writes *και οι* alone of Greeks with *m boh*<sup>91</sup> *syr arm Iren*<sup>int</sup>. The support for B's reading (which *W-H* adopt) † is Latin, viz. *Tert Aug a e ff* and *sahidic*. ‡ I add this therefore also under the heading "Latin-Coptic."

- vi. 9. — *εν* (*post παιδαριον*) *NBD*[*contra Sod*<sup>250</sup>]*LNΠ\*WΨ 1 157 al*<sup>15</sup> *Sod*<sup>decom</sup> *a b d e l syr cu aeth Orig Chr Cyr et W-H & Sod txt*. Apparently to remove a superfluous word. Why should any add? (Coptic emphasises with the indefinite article *οτι ουρε sah*, *οταλ οτ boh*, eliminating the *εν* following).

42. Yet another case of "pairs." The second *ουτος* is removed from the verse by *BCDLTW Sod*<sup>250</sup> *min. pauc. W-H & Sod txt a d ff q sah boh syr cu sin arm aeth Chr Cyr*, but against all others. Why should it have been added? It is pleonastic in Greek, but not so semantically speaking.

- vii. 4. See under "Latin."

6. Another question of "pairs." For: "*ο καιρος ο εμος ουπω παρεστιν ο δε καιρος ο υμετερος παντοτε εστιν ετοιμος*" B substitutes *in secundo loco παρεστιν* for *εστιν* to make the antithesis euphonious or perfect. It appears to be in very questionable taste, and presupposes that every other ms changed the second *παρεστιν* to *εστιν* for opposite reasons. Not a single other Greek does this, nor 892 nor Paris<sup>97</sup> nor any of *Soden's* otherwise sympathetic cursives. Some vulgates (*EFKM̃QVX̃Z*<sup>2</sup>), but no *vett*, have *adest* for *est* here, but all *vett* carefully distinguish, having *venit* or *advenit* or *adest* (*e*) in the first place, and *est* uniformly in the second place. *Sah* and *boh* both differentiate and so do *syr*. *W-H* keep a discreet silence, printing *εστιν*.

† Really in all these matters Hort surpasses himself. The evident reincarnation of an Alexandrian critic of the third or fourth century, he has managed to mislead modern "scholars" into thinking that all these little "niceties" were basic, and that a "revision" forsooth excluded them all!

‡ *Boh* strongly opposes, some *boh* having pleonastically *οτι οτ ηη δε*.

John

- vii. 8. Although B has large support here for *οὐτω ἀναβαίω*, the consensus of opinion of antiquity (*Porph Epiph Chr Cyr Ephr Aug Auct quaest*) is with **NDKMII** † *it<sup>pl</sup> vg boh (diserte) arm aeth syr cu sin georg slav pers* for *οὐκ ἀναβαίω*, which Hort only places in his margin, retaining *οὐτω ἀναβ.* in his text. Can anyone suppose that if B had been on the other side it would not have turned the scale? Yet here, although supported by *sah* and W, it is manifestly an ancient "improvement" which D and the good Latins, *syr boh* and the bulk of the versions, will have none of. I regret that the Oxford edition of 1910 follows Hort with *οὐτω* in text and *οὐκ* in margin, instead of reversing it.‡ In this connection I would like to remind Dr. Souter of his own words quite recently expressed ('Text and Canon,' p. 129): "The readers of the present work would do well to ponder every word he writes on the subject of New Testament textual criticism, for no authority of our time surpasses him in learning and judgment." This sentence refers to Professor F. C. Burkitt, and this is what he has to say of situations exactly such as the evidence indicates in St. John vii. 8: "*The question at issue is what right we have to reject the oldest Syriac and the oldest Latin when they agree*" (F. C. B. 'Introduction' to Barnard's *Clem<sup>alex</sup>*), because, as he says elsewhere (*op. cit.*): "*With Clement's evidence before us we must recognise that the EARLIEST texts of the Gospels are fundamentally 'Western' in every country of which we have knowledge, even in Egypt.*" I have already used these remarks of Dr. Burkitt elsewhere, as headings to my study of the books of *Dimma* and *Moling*, and Dr. Souter will please to recognise that I "ponder every word" of Dr. Burkitt on the subject. Perhaps more than he (Dr. Souter) does, for if Dr. Souter (*op. cit.*, p. 138) approves the addition of the words *καὶ τῆς νύμφης* at Matt. xxv. 1 which "has now received the support of the Old Syriac version and is therefore proved to be 'Western' in the widest, and not merely in the geographical sense," he must apply the same canon of criticism to *other* places, irrespective of B and **N**. As a matter of fact this addition of *καὶ τῆς νύμφης* stands upon another footing, and I am not at all clear that we should receive it. The valuable cursive 892 reads alone *τῶν νυμφίων* for *τοῦ νυμφίου καὶ τῆς νύμφης*, revealing a situation which calls for very detailed examination.§ This

† Add 17\*\* 389 p<sup>scr</sup> w<sup>scr</sup> p<sup>scr</sup> Laur<sup>A</sup> 104 Sod<sup>410</sup> 1091 1246 δ 371 δ 462.

‡ Soden does reverse it against Sod<sup>203</sup>, having *οὐκ ἀναβαίω* in text and *οὐτω* in margin.

§ τῶ νυμφίῳ C 157 soli, ut latt sponso.

reading of 892 I have not seen referred to anywhere, and Dr. Souter himself has not used Dr. Rendel Harris' very interesting collation of this valuable British Museum codex. But the proposition holds good, viz. if we are to believe  $\text{DX}\Sigma\text{T}^{\text{vid}}$  latt syr arm Orig<sup>int</sup> Tichon Arnob Op<sup>imp</sup> Hil for + και της νυμφης in Matt. xxv. 1 against Aug and the rest, how much more are we to believe D latt syr strengthened by  $\Sigma\text{KMII}$  arm aeth georg slav pers boh Porph Epiph Chr Cyr Ephr Aug Quaest at John vii. 8.

In such connections we can profitably study matters of order, such as vii. 12 33 (see under "Order"), where perhaps the basic text omitted the word subsequently added in different positions.

- vii. 34. Another question of "pairs." To: "ζητησετε με και ουχ ευρησετε" BNTX [non fam 1 teste Lake] 213 258 2<sup>pe</sup> w<sup>scr</sup> Sod<sup>183 190</sup> sah boh syr aeth W-H [non Sod] would add με to complete the "pair." It is difficult to suppose that all others including DW Sod<sup>180</sup> 892 Paris<sup>91</sup> removed the second με. Rather is it a "version" influence on BTX.

*ibid.* Observe in the same verse *fin.* that B alone (cf. georg arm) adds *εκει*, which can be traced to the unique addition by the *sahidic* and *bohairic* here of *εποϋ* ("to it").

36. B[non N]TX sah boh syr aeth, with G 1[non fam], 892 2<sup>pe</sup> W-H this time, again add a second με in the same phrase as in vii. 34.

In the latter case G 1 892 join, and N 213 ? 258 w<sup>scr</sup> Sod<sup>190</sup> ? abandon BTX and the four versions which remain constant in the error with Westcott and Hort.

39. δ (pro οὐ) B and EKMSUVAΛ min<sup>30</sup> and 604 [non 892 (Harris ed.) non Paris<sup>91</sup>] but against  $\Sigma\text{DGHLNTWX}\Gamma\Delta\Pi$  al. pl and Cyr<sup>hier</sup> Chr Thdor<sup>hierac</sup> Cyr (Nonn) Thdt; in other words, B has no Patristic support. It is rather a difficult construction, and B with LTW Evst 18 proceeds to change the tense of πιστευοντες following, to πιστευσαντες, and then conflates with *αγιον δεδομενον* as against omission of both words by  $\Sigma\text{KTII}$  Orig Cyr, while some add *αγιον* and some add *δεδομενον*. It will be observed that B's supporters LT and W are in varying positions in this verse in the three changes under review. [See *ante* as to addition by B.]

41. In the "pair" of expressions *αλλοι...αλλοι* it is to be noticed that some and 1 33 248 al. a c f ff vg sah boh arm (aeth) Orig Cyr add δε after the second *αλλοι*, which is found also in *textus receptus* and in *sah* against its usual method; (BLNTXW Sod<sup>180</sup> substitute οἱ δε).

Now St. John's method seems to be against this, for at

John

ix. 9 *ἄλλοι ἐλεγον... ἄλλοι ἐλεγον* remains without copula and only *ℵ* and a few add *δε*, while *B* and the great majority abstain. I mention it because there are other places involved, all in the same class, as, in the same chapter vii. above at verse 12: *οἱ μὲν ἐλεγον... ἄλλοι ἐλεγον*, where *BTXW Sod*<sup>950</sup> *sah boh Cyr* and a number of Old Latins (with *textus receptus* again) add *δε*. I had not intended to mention this place, supported as it is by *c f ff g l vg* (although observe that *b d e q† r δ foss* oppose),† but when comparing vii. 41 and ix. 9 it became evident that the +*δε* on behalf of all those who add is probably anti-neutral and in the nature of revision.

- vii. 46. Following a variety of changes of order in the phrase *οὐδεποτε ἐλάλησεν οὕτως ἄνθρωπος* (order of *BLNTX Orig Cyr*), it is to be observed that *BLTW 225 229\* boh* and *Cyr Orig* drop the clause following (against *ℵ* and the rest) of "*ὡς οὗτος (λάλει) ὁ ἄνθρωπος.*" The semitic doublet was objected to. Tischendorf remarks "offendebat scripturae prolixitas, hinc additamentum vel in brevius contraxerunt vel totum omiserunt."
- viii. 16. *ἡ κρίσις ἡ ἐμὴ ἀληθινή ἐστιν* *BDLTXW 33 213 892 Sod*<sup>c</sup> *Orig 1/2 W-H & Sod txt*, against the use of *ἀληθης* by the others. *d* and the latins use *verum*. Only *gat vg*<sup>E</sup> vary with *justum* as *δικαία c<sup>scr</sup> Sod*<sup>337 541 1250</sup> *Evst 60 [Evan 157 does not join Evst 60] Cyr Chr 2/3*. It does appear as if *ἀληθινή* were more in the nature of an "improvement" than otherwise. Why should the rest abandon it? It would have been a welcome variation from the use of *ἀληθης* above, if correct, and certainly not tampered with by all the rest including *Ψ* and *Paris*<sup>97</sup>. (*D* has *ἀληθεινή* alone at viii. 14.)
19. See under "Order."
38. *καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ἀκούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς*. This (instead of ... *ἑώρακατε*... of the rest), by *BCKLX* and *ℵ<sup>c</sup>W 1 (131) [non 118-209] 4 5 fam 13 [non 124] 15 33 42 68 91 116 122\*\* 145 213 229\*\* 249 299 dpiw<sup>scr</sup> and 892 Sod*<sup>950</sup> *al. po. f goth boh aeth<sup>allq</sup> arm Orig<sup>pluries diserte</sup> Cyr [non ℵ rell, non Ψ, non Paris<sup>97</sup>, not even Laura<sup>A 104</sup>]*. This is of course to avoid the difficulty, hence against the canon of the "harder" reading to be preferred. Hort swallows *ἡκούσατε* and his margin is silent. *Soden* acts similarly. *Clem<sup>alex</sup>* is silent, but *NDTV Paris*<sup>97</sup> and eleven other uncials are not, nor the *Latins* nor *sah* nor *syr sin* nor *Tert*, who all witness to *ἑώρακατε* and *vidistis*§ as Tischendorf

† *Tisch* misquotes *q* on the other side.

‡ *a = et alii*, for which *Soden* also quotes *r*, but *r* in *Abbott's* edition has plainly ...*et* (for *est*) *alii dicebant*. *Soden's* collator seems to have misread *et* for ...*st*.

§ *f* only of *Latins* with *goth* join *B* in improving.

diligently explained by quoting *Apollin*<sup>cat 280</sup> in full “*εωρακεναι και παρα τω πατρι λεγων ουκ οφθαλμων τινα ορασιν εδηλωσεν αλλα γνωσιν φυσικην, επει και εκεινος φασκων εωρακεναι παρα τω πατρι αυτων ουκ οφει δηπουθεν εωρακεναι λεγει αλλα τη ενοικουση πονηρια...*” Yet we persist in receiving *Origen*’s third century “improvement” against this fourth century witness *diserte* and *Tertullian* earlier. The Oxford edition of 1910 follows Hort here to its discredit. Will the critics not kindly apply Burkitt’s canon at this place also, and see in the consentient voice of *syr sin* and *syr pesh pers arab* (*cu* is wanting) with the *diatessaron* (quoting Jno viii. 12/60 in full sequence) and all the Latins [but *f*] with *sah georg slav* and *Apollin* and *Tert* a full rebuttal of the “improving” voice of *Orig* and his minions, even with *syr hier* added to them?

Here is Hort’s weak note, in ‘Notes on Select Readings,’ p. 88:

“viii. 38. ἃ ἐγὼ...πατρός] ἡ ἐγὼ ἃ ἐώρακα παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ μου [ταῦτα] λαλῶ· καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ἃ ἐώρακατε παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν· Western and, with ὁ twice substituted for ἃ, and ταῦτα omitted, Syrian (Gr. Lat. Syr. Aeth.): but aeth omits μου and ὑμῶν.” For later and better information [*von Soden* to the contrary notwithstanding] cf. *Merx* pp. 208/212 in the *Johannes* volume, and note (on p. 209) his expression: “und es ist Willkür zu sagen, B hat überall hier das Richtige.”

- viii. 39. Another very important question of “pairs” or more than “pairs.” *ει τεκνα του Αβρααμ εστε τα εργα του Αβρααμ ποιειτε.* So B\* and the *vg* alone followed by *W-H txt.* *Origen* is on both sides, quoting very often. Now most authorities, with *Eus Epiph Cyr*<sup>Hier</sup> *Did Bas Cyr*<sup>Alex</sup> have *ητε* and *εποιετε*, while those who join B for *εστε*, viz. *NDLT Eust* 60, still follow with *εποιετε*, and some have *εποιετε αν.* The cursives are practically all for *ητε* and *εποιετε* or *εποιετε αν.* True 604 has *ποιετε*, but retains *αν.* Paris<sup>97</sup> has *ητε* and *εποιετε αν.* The Coptics and the Versions oppose B; *syr sin* appears to support. I hardly think B has preserved the “neutral” text. If so, why do *sah* and *boh* not follow? It looks rather as if B and *Origen* here were playing a part, for *Origen* knows and gives both readings. The Old Latins, with the exception of *ff*, are against B, while *b* and *Orig*<sup>int</sup> add *utique.*

The matter has no importance in one sense, and yet in another it has a very great importance. The record of B as exhibited in these pages is not sufficiently good to trust him without better support. D and the supporters having *εστε* follow with *εποιετε.* The transition from *εστε* to *εποιετε*

John

offends apparently, yet they retain. While *εστε* may therefore be basic, *ποιετε* seems to be the reverse; *ητε* may indeed be a revision, but *εποιετε* rather than *ποιετε* appears basic.

*Note.*—In case it should be thought that I had gone crazy over questions of “pairs,” I would like to exhibit another place in St. John quite in the heart of these changes by B, where **N** indulges in this, in order to show that the changes were either premeditate on the part of both MSS or were influenced by a version. Observe then that at John vii. 22 in the clause: *ουχ οτι εκ του μωυσεως εστιν αλλ εκ των πατερων*, an additional *οτι* is supplied by **N** after *αλλ*. This is shared by *syr cu sin*, but NOT by *sah boh*, as might have been expected, nor by the other versions, and is found in no other Greek or Latin witness. My point therefore appears to be well taken that the changes were made to “improve.” It is extremely unlikely that such complementary expressions should have been removed by any revisor. Why, for instance, should **Ψ** or 892 or Paris<sup>97</sup> or Laura<sup>A 104</sup>, all derived from a similar MS to the parent of **N** and B, cut out this second *οτι*? Why also should they all have *εν σαββατω* while B with *b e r* quite alone omit *εν* in this same verse? *Do they not preserve the true text as against B and N respectively in BOTH places?*

John

viii. 51/52. We now come to one of the grossest disfigurements of the text in the whole of the narrative perpetrated by B. The facts are so clear that Westcott and Hort abandon his testimony completely and do not even give the reading a place in their margin, although B has the support of *Eust* 32 and *e*, to which now add Paris<sup>97</sup>. It is not discussed in Hort's ‘Notes on Select Readings,’ for it would have been exceedingly distressing to him to discuss it. But was it *honest* to pass it by in silence? Let the facts speak for themselves.† Burgon omitted to comment on this because Hort and the Revision mercifully left the record alone. But in an arraignment of codex B it is my duty to record the shameful mutilation of scripture here, justifying all I have previously said of B as to “pairs” of expressions.

In John viii. verse 51 the Saviour says: “*Αμην αμην λεγω υμιν εαν τις τον εμον λογον (ορ τον λογον τον εμον ορ τον λογον μου) τηρηση, θανατον ου μη θεωρηση εις τον αιωνα.*”

In verse 52 the Jews reply: “*νυν εγνωκαμεν οτι δαιμονιου εχεις. Αβρααμ απεθανεν και οι προφηται, και συ λεγεις εαν τις τον λογον μου (ορ μου τις τον λογον, ορ τις μου τον λογον, ορ [33 Orig] τις τον εμον λογον) τηρηση, ου μη γευσεται θανατου (εις τον αιωνα ομ. D b c d ff l syr sin).*”

† Souter also ignores it in his notes to the Oxford edition of the N.T. 1910.



In verse 52, however, B calmly substitutes *θανατου ου μη θεωρηση* for *ου μη γευσηται θανατου*, repeating the form of verse 51 in order to make no difference in the wording of the Jews' reply to the actual words spoken by our Lord. *Eust* 32 does the same, so does *e* latin, and so does Paris<sup>97</sup> unknown to Hort, and a new witness 213 (<sup>129</sup>) adduced by *Soden*. But this last support only justifies all I have said as to such particular cursive testimony not *helping* B but re-accusing his text of an ancient error. No other authority changes, for the simple reason (as Hort and the Revisionists admit) that the record is perfectly plain that the Jews in their excitement repeated the phrase of verse 51 in slightly different language. *Origen* is a witness to this effect, which Hort here dared not put aside. Neither *Tisch* nor *Tregelles* nor *Hort* nor the *Revision* nor *Souter* nor *Soden* then follow B, although it had both Greek and Latin support. If we look into the matter still more closely we shall find that *syr sin*, some mss of *pesh* (but not *diatess*) and *aeth*, while holding "shall not taste of death" in verse 52, put *taste* back into verse 51, replacing *θεωρηση* there by *γευσηται*, exactly for the same purpose of harmonising the records in verses 51 and 52. What a clear picture of these critical authorities dealing with scripture.†

Now such absolutely unpardonable handling of the record by B here, raises afresh the whole question of the readings of this ms elsewhere, which Hort asks us to accept in so many other places, as does Dr. Souter. The latter in his 'Text and Canon' (p. 103 *seq*) has this to say of Westcott and Hort: "Their work is held in the highest esteem in all civilised countries, and on the foundation they have laid *the future will do well to build*." But if the foundations are insecure, as I claim to have shown in this volume, is it not an unfortunate myopia from which Dr. Souter and others are suffering? Do they really know B? I cannot believe it possible, or Dr. Souter would not write on p. 22 (*op. cit.*) after citing two of the "secondary traces here and there in its text": "But such features are like spots in the sun." The features to which I have drawn attention, of this constant striving for "consistency," for running the narrative in "pairs," for general linguistic or grammatical "niceties" or "improvements," with occasional "conflations" or bold

---

† The omission of *εις τον αιωνα* at the end of verse 52 by D d b c ff l and *syr sin* is not perhaps on the same footing.

John

"harmonies,"† culminating in this passage in John viii. 51/52, proves something quite different, and it is evident that textual theories and a text built upon B are liable to be swept away owing to the foundations being quite insecure. As to "spots in the sun" they may not perceptibly dim the brightness of the luminary to eyes some millions of miles away, but studied *a little more closely* they are indications of grave danger. These spots on the sun of B have had as disastrous an effect on our N.T. studies as have had real sunspots on our agricultural situation on many occasions.

Souter's simile is unfortunate. Perhaps it is prophetic! This matter of harmonising by B in viii. 51/52 is followed so closely by another peculiar matter (viii. 55), see under "Change of Case," that it should be consulted by the student at once. There Hort and the *R.V.* will be found in disagreement, Hort following BADW *Sod*<sup>250</sup> *minn*<sup>6</sup> *contra*<sup>rell omni</sup>, while the *R.V.* restores the usual genitive and tacitly accuses Hort's foundation of being wrong. [A somewhat similar case to that of John viii. 51/52 may be seen at xvi. 16/17, concerning which note Burgon's remarks in 'Causes of Corruption,' pp. 105/106.]

ix. 14. See under "Latin."

16. Another "pair." The verse begins *ελεγον ουν...* Later for *αλλοι ελεγον*, **NB**DT<sup>W</sup> *fam 1 fam 13 22 2<sup>pe</sup> Sod*<sup>178</sup> *c d r<sub>2</sub> sah boh syr [non pers] (aeth kai)*, have *αλλοι δε ελεγον*, against the great majority without copula. *ff* (Buchanan) is against it, not for it, as Tischendorf says from an uncertain phrase of Sabatier. Tisch. also errs as to the vulgates by saying "vg<sup>cle</sup> et<sup>chil mu</sup>" but only *vg*<sup>EW</sup> recorded by Wordsworth have a copula. Tischendorf claims ten cursives, but none of Matthaëi's or Scrivener's cursives have it, and it seems to be limited to *fam 1 fam 13 2<sup>pe</sup>* and "Colb" (22, confirmed to me by Sanders). Others seem to lack it completely and it does not appear in 892 nor in Paris<sup>97</sup> and only in *Soden's*<sup>178</sup> of all his cursives, but he accepts it openly, although Hort only took it into his text in brackets.

20 *init.* *απεκριθησαν + ουν* **NB** 2<sup>pe</sup> [*teste Sod.*] *Evst 15 g q vg<sup>E</sup> dim Tisch*<sup>121</sup> *W-H [nil mg]* only against no copula **DGLT**<sup>UWXH</sup> 1 33 *al. latt*<sup>pl</sup> *sah boh arm Cyr*, and +*δε* the rest and *Sod txt.*

I would not call attention to this, but that the whole graphic narrative, abounding in repetitions, must be examined most closely (much more closely than I can do in these few notes on ch. ix.) and that in ix. 10, ix. 17, **N** or B or **NB** add an *ουν*

† See *ante* and *post* under all these heads.

John

which probably does not belong to the text. See also ix. 26. The matter is settled as far as I am concerned by observing that in ix. 27 B alone with *aeth* and *georg* adds an *οὐν* after *τι* (appearing in Hort's margin). Observe the variations as to *οὐν*, *δε*, *και* (NB *sah*), and the absence of the copula here by the mass.

- ix. 30. +*το* (*ante θαυμαστον*) NBLNT<sup>1</sup> 1 [*non fam*, although Soden quotes 118, which *Lake* specifically denies] 22? 33 397 Laura<sup>A</sup> 104 Sod<sup>183</sup> 1110 *sah* Chr Cyr W-H & Sod *txt* against omission by all others. Why should the others omit if *το* were basic? But this should doubtless be referred to coptic (*sah* **ΧΕ ΤΑΙ ΡΩ ΤΕ ΤΕΥΠΗΡΕ**, *boh* **ΧΕ ΘΑΙ ΡΩ ΤΕ ΤΩΦΗΡΕ**) reproduced by *arab* alone of later versions. *Syr* has "to wonder" or "mirandum" as a *r*, for "mirabile," and Paris<sup>97</sup> substitutes *εθαυμαζον* for *το θαυμαστον εστιν*, while all the others with WD and Ψ hold *θαυμαστον* "a wonderful thing."

31. See under "Order." In this the following verse, B again follows coptic (against **Ν**) apparently disliking the position of *αμαρτωλων* after *οτι*, which word would hardly have been found there if this order were not basic.

- x. 25. Another "pair." See under "Change of Tense."

- xi. 29. See under "Change of Tense."

30. "οὐπω δε εληλυθει ο ιησους εις την κωμην αλλ ην εν τω τοπω οπου υπηγητησεν αυτω η Μαρθα." In this quiet and dignified sentence, witnessed to by ADLΓΔΔΠ *unc al' min permult* and *syriac*, NBCXX<sup>b</sup> 1 33 213 242 249 Sod<sup>211a</sup> some *Latins* and *boh* introduce *ετι* after *ην*, while F *a e* and *sah* add it before *ην*. The addition in different positions is suspicious in itself, but this has never influenced Hort apparently nor the school of Hort, for he and the Oxford edition and Soden diligently add it. Yet why should the other school have dropped it? It savours distinctly of officious "improvement." Observe that

*sah* has **ΑΛΛΑ ΕΤΙ ΠΕΡΙΕΤΕ ΠΙΜΑ** and

*boh* has **ΑΛΛΑ ΠΑΡΕΧΕ ΟΥΤΗ ΠΕ ΔΕΝ ΠΙΜΑ.**

44. Another question of "pairs" in the final clause:

"λυσετε αυτον και αφετε αυτον υπαγειν."

BCL Sod<sup>250</sup> 33 157 Paris<sup>97</sup> alone of Greeks, *copt Orig<sup>ter</sup>*. Where are the Latins and the Syriacs? All the Latins (except *ff* with its coptic affiliations) and the Syriacs (except *hier* and *diatess*) are with **Ν** and the mass *without* the second *αυτον* against Messrs. Hort and [Soden].

It is possible that this is a common error of base, however, between B and *copt*, for it is opposed by W as well as **Ν al.** It might have occurred from misreading *γι* in *υπαγειν* after

John

αφεται (for αφετε). Thus in W you find ΑΦΕΤΑΙΥΠΑΓΕΙΝ. It is important as placing W *behind* the diatessaron.

- xi. 45. και θεασαμενοι  $\hat{a}$  εποιησεν  $\aleph$  and the great majority, with Origen six times (and  $\acute{o}\sigma\alpha$  314 d<sup>scr</sup>) W-H<sup>mss</sup> Sod<sup>mg</sup>, but  $\delta$  BC<sup>4</sup>DA<sup>2</sup> (also C<sup>2,3</sup>. ο επ. σημειον) 1 244 249 Sod<sup>190 fam CN</sup> e goth sah aeth W-H<sup>1st</sup> Sod<sup>1st</sup>. This seems to be an absolute "improvement" referring to the miracle of the raising of Lazarus. It occurs immediately after verse 44 which recounts the actual resurrection, and  $\delta$  is so absolutely natural after θεασάμενοι that no one would have changed  $\delta$  here to  $\hat{a}$ , while there is every reason to change  $\hat{a}$  to  $\delta$  as do B and a few. W does *not* do it. Here observe Origen absolutely opposed to B's "easy" reading. Origen,  $\aleph$ , and Tisch prefer the "harder" reading.

In verse 46 following ειπον αυτοις CD 249 397 with M Sod<sup>1114 fam N</sup> b e goth aeth repeat  $\delta$ , but  $\aleph$ B and most, this time keeping with Origen, have  $\hat{a}$ . I have no doubt  $\hat{a}$  is right in both places. The *bohairic* shows that *criticism* of these verses was in vogue, for it reverses the whole process, having in verse 45 θεασαμενοι  $\hat{a}$  and in verse 46 ειπον αυτοις  $\delta$ .

57. εντολας (pro εντολην)  $\aleph$ BIMW fam 1 138 254 i<sup>cr</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> [teste Sod] Sod<sup>1443</sup> Orig<sup>bis</sup>. A clear "improvement" adopted by Tisch W-H and Soden.† See *sub voce* "Indeterminate," after remarks on xi. 54.

- xii. 12. See under "Solecisms of B."

13. Apparently another question of "pairs": ευλογημενος ο ερχομενος εν ονοματι κυριου και ο βασιλευς του Ισραηλ. Only  $\aleph$ BLQ *boh aeth* and Origen and the editors Tisch W-H and Soden† indulge in this second και ο or at any rate they alone add the και to make the two parts. Some and sah have  $\acute{o}$  before βασιλευς.

- xiii. 18. τινας (pro ούς) Undoubted correction, thinking to improve. It occurs in the phrase εγω (γαρ) οίδα ους εξελεξαμην, and τινας is only found in  $\aleph$ BCLM 33 157 213 397 Sod<sup>1091 1098 1110 1443 8470</sup> Orig<sup>quater</sup> Cyr adopted by the editors Tisch W-H and Soden.† Indeed Origen seems to have a patent on this: "τινας εξελεξαμην, οπερ απλουστερον μεν τοιουτου εστι· τις εστιν εκαστος ων

† I mention the three critical editions specifically at these four places to emphasise what Burgon said long ago. The critical editors considered and Soden still considers that these minority mss are of paramount importance irrespective of the fact that the grouped mss represent hardly more than one tradition. To combat this view I am presenting these pages. Because Hort supports Tischendorf, and Soden supports Hort, it does not follow that they are right. The English Revisers oppose in xiii. 18 and Souter does not give the evidence for τινας in his notes. If Souter believed Hort was right it was his duty to his readers to give the evidence. Does Souter believe  $\aleph$ BCLM 33 157 Origen Cyr and Hort to be wrong here?

ἐξελεξαμένη οὐδα." At first sight *τινας* being the "harder" reading might appear justifiable, but it is almost certainly editorial. It is contradicted by all others including WΨ and 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> so much in accord with the group elsewhere. It is also contradicted by all the versions. A trace would surely remain elsewhere if *τινας* were correct. As I plodded over document after document I was amazed to find no other trace of *τινας* until Soden produced two *Sinai* codices, two at *Jerusalem*, one at *Athos*.

- xiii. 26. βαψας ουν (*pro kai εμβαψας*) NBCLX 33 213 892 Sod<sup>1110 tam C</sup> a Orig 2/4 and Cyr with the editors Tisch W-H and Soden against the rest.†
37. ακολουθειν αρτι (*pro ακολουθησαι αρτι*) B(C\*). A sheer "improvement." See under "Change of Tense." Hort follows B alone here.
- xiv. 7. This is another question of "pairs," but different from most. Here, for (και) απαρτι γνωσχετε αυτον και εωρακατε αυτον by the great mass supported by all the versions and *Tertullian*, BC\* and they alone with W-H<sup>1st</sup> [and they are often guilty of other tricks together; see many instances in St. John elsewhere in these pages and just previously] would suppress the second αυτον, reading απαρτι γνωσχετε αυτον και εωρακατε. It is a perfectly fair criticism that this is editing, even if here it be a question of the suppression of one of the "pair," because the place troubled some scribes and translators. Thus 33 68 250 d<sup>scr</sup> Eust 47<sup>sem</sup> 60 and some arm<sup>codd</sup> suppress και εωρακατε αυτον altogether,‡ while the *slav* version with X<sup>b</sup> (= Sod A<sup>4</sup>) suppresses the first αυτον, writing "Ye knew and ye saw him," as does the book of *Dimma*: "cognoscetis et vidistis eum." While *r* (not reported for Tischendorf) and *vg*<sup>d</sup> are to be added to the Greeks BC for the elision of the final αυτον. These authorities should be added in Tischendorf's apparatus. Horner does not give *r*, citing only BC, because unfortunately he does not quote *r*, a very important witness, especially in St. Luke and St. John but Soden gives *r* here. (See beyond again on xiv. 17.)
10. Yet another matter of a "pair." Instead of *ὁ δε πατηρ ὁ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων* of nearly all Greeks (and *a c d f q r* *foss* qui in me manet) BLΨ [*negl.* Sod. Ψ] Sod<sup>351 1110</sup> Orig Aeth Did Cyr<sup>text et com</sup> elide the second *ὁ*, reading *ὁ δε πατηρ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων* (= no doubt *vg* with *b e ff g* in me manens). That this was

† See footnote on page 385.

‡ Attributed by von Soden to homoiooteleuton!

the *Alexandrian* way, the unusual consensus of *Orig Ath Cyr* with *BLΨ* most freely attests. No cursives appear to join (except the two new ones of *von Soden* mentioned above which are quite "of the family"), not even *Paris*<sup>97</sup>, and *W* goes with *D* and the rest against it. But whereas *B* prefers "pairs," here he seems to dislike the double *ὁ* on account of the *δε*—present in most copies, only absent from a few cursives. Had the *δε* been absent: "*ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων*" would not have offended, but in *ὁ δε πατήρ ὁ* it seems to have appeared redundant. The other versions seem clearly to have read a second *ὁ*. It is not trifling to mention this matter, for *B* shows us *four* variations in this one verse: (a) *πιστευσεις* for *πιστευεις* with the *bohairic* alone [*boh* neglected by *Soden*], (b) —*λεγω* alone, (c) —*ὁ* *ante ἐν ἐμοὶ* with *LΨ* and *Alexandria* as above, and finally (d) *ποιει τα εργα αυτου* with *ND* as against *ποιει τα εργα αυτος* *LX* and *W* 33 213 *Sod*<sup>110</sup> *Paris*<sup>97</sup> *Cyr*<sup>com</sup> and *αυτος ποιει τα εργα* *A* and the rest with *Orig Ath Ps-Ath Chr Cyr*<sup>txt</sup>, while *e* and *Tert* omit *αυτος* or *αυτου* altogether, and are perhaps basic.

Now *B* cannot be right in all four places. *Hort* neglects the first two (a and b) as errors, but accepts the other two (c and d), thus in the last case (d) opposing *Alexandria*, as represented by *Orig Ath Cyr*, while going with them in the third case (c). This is properly in accord with his principle that it is *B* which is "neutral," however rough the fourth case may seem. But what about the first case (a)? Why should we lose the *πιστευσεις* of *B*? It is supported by all the *bohairic*. Is it *not* neutral? But I can assure you that there is nothing "neutral" in *B*. Having written *αυτου* (= *εαυτου* no doubt) in this verse, he proposes to amend the next verse in accordance therewith. Therefore we find *B* and 229\* (*aeth*) only writing in verse 11 *δια τα εργα αυτου πιστευετε μοι* against *Ath* and *Cyr*, who with most have *δια τα εργα αυτα πιστευετε μοι*, whereas *Tert* 157 and some cursives omit *αυτα* and *αυτου* and have only *δια τα εργα πιστ.* which is very possibly basic and both the additions of later date, since *q r* and *syr arm pers diatess* and *boh* also omit *αυτα* and *αυτου*. *Hort* has *αυτα* in his text and accepts the *αυτου* of *B* in his margin; but neither I think are "neutral" or basic. True the *sahidic* says "Believe because of his works," but this does not agree with *B*, because *sah* destroys the *μοι* at the end of the sentence (as *NDL* 33 *etc.*) which *B* holds. *B* is left absolutely alone with 229\* and *aeth*: *ex opere ejus credite mihi*.

[Scrivener's *z* (*semel*) with *Paris*<sup>97</sup> has *ταυτα* for *αυτα*, while

the new MS W goes with **NDL** *δια τὰ ἔργα αὐτὰ πιστ. absque moi fin.*]

- xiv. 17. The same thing as at xiv. 7 occurs here as to "pairs." For : *οτι ου θεωρει αὐτο ουδε γινωσκει αὐτο*, **NBW** Paris<sup>97</sup> and a *dim* *Lucif* *W-H*<sup>1st</sup> [*nil mg*] alone suppress the second *αὐτο* against all others, all versions and *Did*<sup>pluries</sup>, and as showing how the matter affected others, *Evan* 287 *vg*<sup>M</sup> *Auct*<sup>quæst</sup> elide the first *αὐτο* (*Soden* does not notice this) writing *quia non videt nec cognoscit eum*, exactly as the *slav* version with *X*<sup>b</sup> and the book of *Dimma* acted in verse 7!

*ibid.* This is followed by the elision of the copula *δε* between *υμεις* and *γινωσκετε αὐτο* by **NBQW** 346 *a*<sup>scr</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>351</sup> *a b sah boh*<sup>allia</sup> *Lucif* *Auct*<sup>quæst</sup> *W-H* & *Sod* *txt* only, after the coptic manner [*Sod* neglects the coptic witness and adds *Ψ* (against *Lake*)], again not only against the mass and the versions, but against *Did*<sup>bis</sup> *Cyr*<sup>iller</sup> and *Cyr*<sup>Alex</sup>.

*ibid.* And again in this verse another "pair" of expressions is involved. Most mss have *μενει* and *εσται* (*οτι παρ υμιν μένει και εν υμιν εσται*). Some read *μενεί* = *g vg arm Nonn* (*μένεί*) and *sah* [*non boh*]. It is clear that *B* understood *μενει* [it is so accented in *B* to-day] for he follows it with *εστιν* for *εσται* alone of the uncials with *D*<sup>\*</sup> (corrected by *D*<sup>2</sup>) *W* and a few cursives (1 *Sod*<sup>183</sup> [*non fam*] 22 69 [*non fam*] 251 254 291 2<sup>pe</sup> *Sod*<sup>178 1443</sup>) and *it*<sup>pl</sup> *syr goth Lucif* *W-H*<sup>1st</sup> *Sod*<sup>mg</sup>, but in view of *B*'s record which I think I have fairly exhibited in the previous pages, it is not absolutely certain that we can accept *εστιν* as original. *εσται* is difficult enough in all conscience following *υμεις γινωσκετε αὐτο*, but if *μενεί* was intended, *εσται* would be in order. *Sah* actually reads "Ye, ye know him because he will remain with you and he will be in you." Paris<sup>97</sup> here reads *εσται* and does not go with *B*, but *W* does so.

23. Now comes a fitting and most lovely specimen of the manipulation of voices to obtain a perfect "pair," which is not only an illustration of what we have contended for, but operates as a climax to all that has gone before.

In the verse *απεκριθη (ο) ιησους και ειπεν αυτω· εαν τις αγαπα με, τον λογον μου τηρησει και ο πατηρ μου αγαπησει αυτον, και προς αυτον ελευσομεθα και μονην παρ αυτω ποιησομεν*, nothing virtually is changed [except by *D*, *vide infra*] until we reach the last word. Here instead of *ποιησομεν* (or *ποιησωμεν*) we are offered *ποιησομεθα* by **NBLXWΠ**<sup>2</sup> 1 *Sod*<sup>183</sup> [*non fam*] *fam* 13 [*non* 124] 33 213 249 254 2<sup>pe</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>1266</sup> *fam* *CN*. This group is practically *one*, as our presentation of evidence elsewhere will show. They offer us then in the final clause the very alliterative sentence: "*και προς αυτον ελευσομεθα και μονην παρ αυτω*

ποιησομεθα." May I ask on what grounds any "revision" would have desired to displace the middle (given the sense) by the active voice here and so to *destroy* the alliterative assonance? If ποιησομεθα had been basic, who would have wished to *change* it to ποιησομεν?† On the other hand, our repeated exhibition of the views entertained as to "pairs" by this very group, headed by B, is most illuminating as to the practical certainty that the B group base changed ποιησομεν to ποιησομεθα. And the proof is not far to seek.

How do the Fathers stand? For they surely represent other codices long since perished which have not reached us but which are cœval with or anterior to the date of B. It is observed that *Origen* is on *both* sides, but with a large preponderance for ποιησομεθα. *Athanasius* is on both sides, *Didymus* is on both sides, *Epiphanius* is on both sides, while *Eusebius* *Marc*<sup>Dia.1</sup> and *Cyril*, the latter only quoting once, remain on the side of B. Hence ποιησομεθα in the fifth century was standardized in Alexandria on the evidence of *Cyril*, but in the third and fourth centuries the Patristic evidence wavers. What was the reason? The reason appears self-evident on its face. Consult Tischendorf's exhibit at this place, and one cannot help realizing that while codices used by *Origen*, *Athanasius* and *Didymus* surely exhibited ποιησομεν, in quoting either from memory or from other (manipulated) codices, these Fathers fell very naturally into the course of following ελευσομεθα by ποιησομεθα. Not that ποιησομεθα was basic, but that it was tuneful, assonant, and admirably fitted the sense "and we ourselves will make abode with him," and hence followed by all three critical editors, *Tischendorf* *Hort* and *von Soden*. I cannot conceive it possible that 'revision' changed ποιησομεθα to ποιησομεν. What does the jury say? And what is the secret then of the middle voice employed here?

In summing up for them I must not omit to draw their attention to the sahidic version: **ΑΥΩ ΠΑΕΙΩΤ ΠΑΜΕΡΙΤῆ ΑΥΩ ΤΗΗΚΥ  
ϞΑΡΟϞ ἡΤΗΤΑΜΙΟ ΠΑΝ ΠΟΥΜΑ ἡϞΩΠΕ ΖΑΖΤΚϞ.**

Whether the sahidic ΠΑΝ—"us"—be the source or the reflection ‡ of the B group base, it is most noteworthy. Horner translates:

*And my Father will love him, and we come unto him, and make for us an abiding place with him.* Therefore, although the future tense is not emphasised, the middle voice *is* emphasised, and we are to read as

† *Soden* adds only 213 *Sod*<sup>1293</sup> 1296 but also his commentary families K<sup>1</sup>C and N, and excerpts from his *H* family ΨΔ and δ<sup>371</sup>. This is interesting as bringing against each other 213 (his <sup>1293</sup>) and his δ<sup>371</sup>, as above concerning *fam* 1 and *fam* 13, and in emphasising the commentary support. *Soden* adopts ποιησομεθα in his text, just as his critical predecessors had done, but that does not give us the "true text." *Sod*<sup>1293</sup> has ποιησομεν.

‡ As to B and *sah* consider most carefully in this connection the passages under Coptic previously tabulated at iv. 16, vii. 3, xii. 16, all of the same character; also vii. 40, viii. 28, ix. 11 27, and especially vii. 34, x. 22, xi. 27.





John

## xvi. 7. Another very distinct "pair."

Instead of *εαν γαρ μη απελθω, ο παρακλητος ουκ ελευσεται προς υμας*, BLΨ (33?) Laura<sup>A 104</sup> Chr, but these alone, substitute *ου μη ελθη* for *ουκ ελευσεται*, reading:

*εαν γαρ μη απελθω, ο παρακλητος ου μη ελθη προς υμας*. Comment is unnecessary, but Hort swallows it whole (without marginal alternative, Soden only has it in his margin), while the Oxford edition of 1910 disallows it and returns to *ουκ ελευσεται* (with Soden<sup>114</sup>) but without a word in the margin or in Souter's notes. [The mass and Paris<sup>97</sup> are with the Revisers against Hort. Both Cyrils and Did Thdt are observed to improvise with *ου μη ερχεται*, as some versions.]

(Obs. the ms 33 in verse 10 substituting *πορευομαι* for *υπαγω* alone with i<sup>cr</sup> v<sup>scr</sup> Sod<sup>K4</sup> Chr† because of *πορευθω* in verse 7 above, and the secret of "accommodation" is laid very bare.)

16/17. See in 'Causes of Corruption,' by Burgon, pp. 105/106.

22. *αρει (pro αιρει)* BD\*Γ W-H<sup>111</sup> Sod<sup>mg</sup> [*non minn vid*] *ερει* N. See under "Change of Tense" for Latin evidence, but the idea of B (with *copt*) is apparently again a question of harmonising pairs or triplets and by a change of a letter (not writing *αιρησει*) he makes a harmony of *παλιν δε οψομαι υμας, και χαρησεται υμων η καρδια, και την χαριν υμων ουδεις αρει αφ' υμων*.

xvii. 11. *καθως και ημεις (pro καθως ημεις)* B\*MSUYH<sup>2</sup> Sod<sup>050</sup> *min<sup>allg</sup>* *f g gat vg syr hier 1/2 arm Ath* [against Cyril]. The group is feeble and savours very much of improvement: "*ινα ωσιν εν καθως (+ και) ημεις*." NDW[Soden misquotes W on the other side]Ψ and all the rest and the versions oppose B and this small company. (Syr *sin* with *a b c e ff r* omits the whole of the last clause in verse 11 from *ω δεδωκας μοι* to the end). I should like to know however upon what principles Hort and Soden refuse to take up this addition of *και* by B supported by five other uncials and *Ath*.

Ψ 33 al<sup>5</sup> et Sod<sup>1.5</sup> add after *εν καθως ημεις* + *εν εσμεν*. (+ *εν* X Sod<sup>050</sup> 213).

12. See under "Coptic." In order to support *ω* for *ους*, approximately the same authorities add *και* before *εφυλαξα*. This is a much less difficult place to adjudicate than many, and seems to me to be very clear manipulation. In verse 11 we have: *πατερ αγιε τηρησον αυτους εν τω ονοματι σου ὃ δεδωκας μοι*. But in verse 12: *στε ημην μετ αυτων (εν τω κοσμω) εγω ετηρουν αυτους εν τω ονοματι σου οὗς δεδωκας μοι εφυλαξα, και ουδεις εξ αυτων απωλετο...*

† Tischendorf neglects Scrivener's codices and Chrysostom (but see *Matthaei ad lcc.*).

The latter is manipulated to...*εγω ετηρουν αυτους εν τω ονοματι ϕ δεδωκας μοι και εφυλαξα*... by BCLW 7 (o) 33 64 Paris<sup>97</sup> *sah arm syr hier Cyr W-H [nil mg] non Soden*. As to *boh* while giving ϕ it does not have *και* before *εφυλαξα*, while *d Hil*, who hold *οδς*, add *και* before *εφυλαξα*. The presence of *Cyr* in the combination shows that it remained an *Alexandrian* tradition until his time. *Σ* hesitatingly writes: *οτε ημην μετ αυτων εγω ετηρουν αυτους εν τω ονοματι κ σου και εφυλασσον και ουδης εξ αυτων απωλετο...* *Σ\** omits *ω δεδωκας μοι* with *syr sin*; *Σ<sup>c</sup>* inserts, with *o* for *ω* (as *Evan* 7 and *sah boh*), and modifies *και εφυλασσον* [*Male Sod de d r cum Σ\**] to *και εφυλαξα* retaining *και*.

The Syriacs and Latins grouped are against this interpretation in verse 12. In verse 11 *syr sin* and the majority of it omit the last clause involving *ω δεδωκας μοι ινα ωσιν εν καθως ημεις*.

- xvii. 21. *πιστευη (pro πιστευση)* *Σ\*BC\*W Sod<sup>κ</sup> [non al.] Clem Eus Tisch W-H*, against the rest and against *Orig Ath Cyr* and *Sod<sup>xt</sup>*. See under "Change of Tense." This is probably "improvement" to agree with the form of *πιστευοντων* in verse 20. If so, it is another rather forced pair. *πιστευση* is undoubtedly right.

22. *ινα ωσιν εν καθως ημεις εν* So (*Σ*)BC\*DLW 1 [*non fam*] 33 397 (Paris<sup>97</sup>) *d e syr hier sin aeth Clem Hipp Eus 2/4 Cyr 2/3 W-H & Sod txt* suppressing *εσμεν*. This may possibly be basic, but *Σ* and Paris<sup>97</sup> are observed to manipulate a little further, which is suspicious. *Σ* and Paris<sup>97</sup> write: *ινα ωσιν εν καθως ημεις* suppressing the final *εν* as well as *εσμεν*, while *Chr* suppresses the whole clause.

*a<sup>cr</sup>* adds *και* before *ημεις* and *P<sup>cr</sup>* omits *ημεις*. *c* inverts: *sicut sumus nos unum*. [*Soden* neglects this testimony]. The Coptics retain the verb. All this points to a rather equivocal position for the minority, although *εσμεν* may be an addition. Observe that the testimony of *Eus* and *Cyr* is on both sides.

- xviii. 30. I fear that we must once more accuse B of an "improving" tendency here. Among the following varieties B has only the countenance of his friend L and of W, yet *Hort* and *Soden* follow suit.

<i>ει μη ην ουτος κακον ποιησας</i>	<i>Σ* cf. syr sah pers</i>	<i>e mali aliquid</i>
" " " " <i>κακον ποιων</i>	BL <sup>Σ</sup> W W-H & Sod	<i>faciens</i>
" " " " <i>κακο ποιων</i>	C*Y 33 <i>Eust</i> 63 a (r)	<i>male faciens</i>
" " " " <i>κακοποιος</i>	AN Gr <sup>pl</sup> Sod <sup>50</sup> et Paris <sup>97</sup>	<i>Latt pl</i>

(malefactor) *verss Eus Chr Cyr*.

It does not look favourable for B when *Cyr* is against him in such a place, and when even *Σ* changes the tense (rather

John

happily here although *Tisch* abandons **N**\* and goes with **N**<sup>c</sup>BLW and *W-H Sod*), and when *Ath* improvises (*κακουργος*), and *Nonnus* paraphrases unnecessarily with *ει μη εην τελεσας αφατον κακον*. It shows a little too much consideration of the passage. None of *Matthaei's* or *Scrivener's* or *Soden's* cursives know anything of any variation nor does *Paris*<sup>97</sup> so close to **NB** hereabouts.

- xviii. 34. *απο σεαυτου συ τουτο λεγεις* BC\*LNΨ *Paris*<sup>97</sup> *Cyr*  
*W-H & Sod txt (Chr απο σαντου...)*

*απο σεαυτου τουτο ειπας* **N**

All the rest including *W* and all reported cursives (but *Paris*<sup>97</sup>) have *αφ εαυτου...* followed by *Tischendorf*.

Surely, surely, if *αφ εαυτου* were the revision, a trace of *απο σεαυτου* would remain in some cursives. **N** has an excuse for revising because his text (with *D*<sup>sup</sup> and some cursives) lacks *συ*, but with *BCLNΨ* and *Cyr* it seems to be a case of pure revision.

- xix. 26. We have been quite a while without an example of a "pair." But the opportunity offers and *B* avails itself of it. We read *Ιησους ουν* (or *δε*) *ιδων την μητερα και τον μαθητην παρεστωτα ον ηγαπα λεγει τη μητρι αυτου...*

Here **NBLXWΨ** 1 22 138 2<sup>pc</sup> *Paris*<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>1110 & 157</sup> *b e arm Cyr* *W-H & Sod* suppress *αυτου* against all others and against *Origen*. The reason seems to be because in the first part of the verse *ιδων την μητερα* is without *αυτου*, therefore *αυτου* should be absent on the second occasion. For a similar reason the latins *a c n* and most versions (but absolutely no Greeks but *Ω* and *Sod*<sup>750</sup> now first adduced by *von Soden*) supply *αυτου* after *την μητερα* in the first place. My critics will please observe the advent of *Ω* and *Sod*<sup>750</sup> and the company which they keep.

29. +*του* (*ante οξους secund.*) **BLWΨ** *Sod*<sup>750</sup> 1 33 138 2<sup>pc</sup> and **N**<sup>c</sup> with the *Georgian* version, but these only followed by *W-H* and *Soden*. It seems to be a sheer "improvement" emphasising the matter upon the second mention of the vinegar: "*σκευος εκειτο οξους μεστον σπογγου ουν μεστον του οξους...*" It is in reality another question of the consideration given to "pairs." (*Soden* says "*και 1 του H*<sup>376</sup>," but *Schmidtke's* edition says nothing of the kind, printing *μεστον οξους* without *του* and without any *και*).

- xx. 6 *init. ερχεται ουν και Σιμων Πιτρος* †**BLX** et **N**<sup>c</sup>T<sup>o</sup>W 33 56-58-61 397 *Sod*<sup>751</sup> *vg*<sup>9M</sup> *W-H & Sod txt.*

† *Wordsworth* omits *B*<sup>r</sup>, and does not record that *r* (which he mentions) reads exactly with the coptics *autem et* and not *ergo et* as *vg*<sup>9M</sup>.

John

(a) and *arm* substitute *καί* for *οὐν*, but none add exactly as the above (except *vg<sup>ex</sup>*) besides the *sah* and *boh* versions which have *ερχεται δε και* as *r* alone of the Latins, so that I cannot place it exactly under "Coptic" or "Coptic and Latin." It seems to be undoubtedly an "improving" accretion in common with *sah boh* and *could not* have been dropped by all the others if basic. *Syr persh* and *sin* (now available again) have *δε* without *και* as the latin fragment *v. †* The coptics preserve this *δε* but add *ζωα* (*boh*), *ζωαω* (*sah*). This *ζωα*, and not *οὐν* simply, implies improvement to the narrative and equates *etiam ipse* as to Peter. Hence it is an accretion in *sah boh* which overflowed to BLXW. The others ignore it, including Ψ and Paris<sup>7</sup> and Cyril (*Pers* and *Georg* have no copula at all).

xx. 13. I cannot let this little matter pass without remark. The text runs with great simplicity:—

"και λεγουσιν αυτη εκεινοι · γυναι, τι κλαιεις; λεγει αυτοις · οτι ηραν τον κυριον μου και ουκ οίδα που εθηκαν αυτον."

Two slight changes of the same nature are here made respectively by *ℵ* and B.

*ℵ* elides the initial *και*, *alone of Greeks* (with 397 [*Sod<sup>C10</sup>*]) and against the weight of evidence, but in the coptic manner with *sah syr sin pers* and some Old Latins. Not so B.

B, on the other hand, *alone of Greeks*, ADDS *και* as an introduction before the woman's reply, reading *και λεγει αυτοις . οτι ηραν . . .*

This seems a small matter, but it is really of the utmost importance. At such a place an examination of the versions is immensely profitable. First then how do the Latins stand? None add any copula in the second place, but the reviser of *q* shows what he thought about it by improvising "*quae dixit*" *alone of Latins* for *dicit eis*, actually suppressing *αυτοις* as *Eus<sup>max</sup>* when reporting the matter "*η δε ειπεν*" supplying an *autem*. Has B then no support from *sah boh syr*? No, none at all. They do not provide a copula, and *pers* beautifully says *ειπεν* without *αυτοις*. When our investigation reaches *aeth* and *arab* they follow B's intuition and add with him a *και*. Turn now to *georg* and the later *sax* and they also find it necessary to add something. But they add *Tunc*.

When Dean Burgon characterised *ℵ* and B as "two false witnesses" was he so very far wrong? Is the evidence at this place not absolutely conclusive of the non-neutral character of their *thinking* process?

[In this conversation much more may be learned. Observe *ℵ* in verses 15 and 16 again.]

† Correct *von Soden* as to *r* and *v*. *r* reads *autem et* but *v* only *autem*. Therefore substitute *v* for *r* in *Soden's* apparatus under "*om. και*."

John

- xx. 19. *οπου ησαν οι μαθηται (-συνηγμενοι)* **N\*ABDIWA\*** 44\* 95 122\* 246\* **k<sup>scr</sup> o<sup>scr</sup>** *Sod*<sup>1043 1083</sup> [*ambo in Sinai*] *a? d q μ dim gat aur vgg 1/2 Vigil Taps syr pesh sin et W-H.*

This aggregation may look strong, but we miss the usual supporting cursives for such an omission, if basic. We miss **LXΨ** among the Greek uncials, while *syr hier sah boh aeth arm georg slav (hiat goth)* all have *συνηγμενοι* with *Eus Cyr<sup>scr</sup>* and *b c e f f g r δ* of the Latins.

The followers of Hort are requested to place *συνηγμενοι* in the margin. Soden retains it in his text!

It is not as if B were not given to "improvement." In the very next verse we have another "pair":

20. *και τας χειρας και την πλευραν* by **BA** apparently quite alone, where the first *και* has been inserted to "rhyme" with *και την πλευραν*. No others do it, not **W** nor **L** nor **Ψ** nor a single minuscule, nor can Soden produce *one* new witness among all his sympathetic codices. No Latins do it, no other version reflects it, yet Hort calmly includes it in his text without a syllable in the margin to indicate that only two mss out of thousands read thus. The Oxford edition of 1910 rejects it without comment. But if ever anything were *deliberate* and not "unconscious" (as Hort says) on the part of B, this small matter is an example of deliberation. And observe that Hort rejected the reading of B above at xx. 13. He takes the *και* here because A (alone) supports. Can foolishness go further?

- xxi. 11. *ανεβη* B *etc.*, or *εβεη* **NLWΨ**, + *ουν* **NBCLNXP<sup>W</sup>Ψ** *Sod*<sup>650</sup> 1 [*non fam*] 23 33 91 138 239 2<sup>pc</sup> *Laura*<sup>A 104</sup> *Sod*<sup>351 1114 1443</sup> *r vg<sup>1738</sup>* *boh sah syr hier Cyr* (and *c vg<sup>D</sup> slav tunc adscendit, syr pesh sin aeth et adscendit*).

This is against D and the other twelve uncials plus **Π\***, all the other *minn*, all the Latins except *c*, *arm georg* and *pers*, and looks very much like an addition to improve the sense. Notwithstanding the imposing array for + *ουν* I challenge it, and when the supporting testimony is analysed it proves to be weak, and not homogeneous.

21. *τουτου + ουν* **NBCD** [*non Sod*<sup>50</sup>] 33 *it vg boh sah Orig Anast Cyr W-H & [Sod]*.

[However in various endeavours elsewhere, in between these places, to be graphic in this chapter, the matter of copulas is manipulated by many of our documents, and it would not be wise to be didactic as to any of the numerous changes which follow.]

23. *ουκ ειπεν δε (pro και ουκ ειπεν)* **NBCW** 33 *Sod*<sup>N 60</sup> *c boh 10/20 sah 2/3 syr pesh hier sin verss al. aliq. Orig Cyr Chr<sup>could</sup> aliq W-H [non Sod]* (*Om. copul. sah 1/3 boh 10/20 [hos negl. Sod.]*).

John

This is distinctly what one would expect. "This word then went abroad among the brethren that that disciple would not die; *but* Jesus did not say..."

whereas the majority of Greeks, with the Latins, *arm*, and *aeth* [but the latter is negligible] say *καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν*, which seems far less natural. But that is just the point. If *δε* were basic, who would ever have thought of changing to *καὶ*? Clearly, we end as we began, with a charge against the B group—whatever its subsidiary company may be—of manipulation of the record. The translator of *pers* saw so clearly how the sentence *should* run, to convey its full sense, that, going beyond the syriac, he says: "*haud (tamen) quod non moriturus esset, dixit (Jesus), SED si velim...*" bringing the *sed* in very late. As Malan translates: "though he did not say that he may not die, but if I wish..."

I do not fear to be accused of straining a point (and observe that *Tischendorf* and *Soden* reject the *NBCW* group here in verse 23), because in the very next verse B doctors the  
xxi. 24. record by adding *καὶ* (see under "Solecisms") and generally shows a desire in this chapter to emphasise matters. Because *Cyril* joins B and the new *ms W* (the complete group for *δ* *καὶ μαρτυρῶν* is now *BW Cyr* [*Soden* adds *Ωρ*]) it does not mend matters. The very same point appealed to a small minority of late Latins, who add *ille* and write "*Hic est discipulus ille qui testimonium...*"

#### *Change without Improvement.*

- iv. 46. *εν κανα* (*pro εις την καναν*) *BN soli*.† Is this neutral? Is it? I insist upon an answer, for it is either deliberate or the grossest kind of carelessness. It is *not* "neutral" apparently for *Hort* and the *Oxford* edition and *Soden* cast it out of their texts, nor could they do otherwise. Well, then it fulfils the other alternative of rank carelessness; but what kind of carelessness? Evidently from a concurrent *version*. It is in the original Greek an instance of the accusative of motion after *ηλθεν*. The verse opens: *ηλθεν ουν παλιν εις την κανα*. *Kana* being treated as indeclinable the Latins say *in Cana*, but the Coptics *ΕΤΚΑΝΑ* (to the *Cana*). *N* however declines it and avoids any chance of difficulty by writing *εις την καναν* (*cf. some vgg.* *B*, unless he was somnolent while looking

† *Soden* reports 348 (his <sup>121</sup>) for *εις κανα* (*-την*), and further adds in support of *B* for *εν κανα* *X<sup>b</sup>* (his *A<sup>4</sup>*) and *Sod*<sup>1003 1448</sup> the former at *Sinai*, the latter now at *Athos*, but both largely sharing version influence elsewhere, as does 348 most distinctly and a real adherent of the *B* family.

John

at the Coptic, must have written it in from the *Latin*, as probably N. At any rate it is not only at the opposite pole to a "neutral" reading, but it shows carelessness *due to a sight of a version*. Many things have previously tended in this direction. Must I go further than this to *prove* my point? The critics certainly cannot fall back here on a joint common Greek base being responsible for readings visible in B and Coptic, or B and Latin, as they are never tired of dinning into my ears, and trying to make me appear over-ingenious or foolish. If the said imaginary lost Greek base influenced B why do the editors not adopt the reading?

One word more. In verse 47 (following) B, with  $\aleph$ CLT<sup>b</sup> and DW with *frag gr-copt (graeco) Crum-Ken*, 33 69 [*non fam*] 213 314 892 Sod<sup>190</sup> [*non Paris*<sup>97</sup>] only of Greeks and *a d e l q foss Orig*, writes *και ηρωτα sine αυτου* with *W-H Sod txt* (against all the rest of the Greeks, the Syriacs, the Coptics and Aethiopic, which have *αυτου*). Hence it was a Graeco-Latin which doubtless misled B in verse 46.

In verse 50 again B with only  $\aleph$ DW Sod<sup>1266 8371</sup> *sah c d l vg Cyr W-H & Soden* writes *επιστευσεν* without a copula, against all the rest *και επιστ.* and LT<sup>b</sup> 213 314 892 s<sup>cr</sup> *επιστ. δε*. Although this style is Coptic, none but two *boh* codices suppress the copula here. It is again Latin or Sahidic influence.

- vi. 23. BNW only of uncials and 71 127 with ten other cursives and a dozen more of *Soden* add *της* before *Τιβεριαδος*. It does not seem to be called for nor do *Tischendorf* or *Hort* or *Soden* insert the article. Why not? Is B's "underlying Greek text" *not* basic here, supported as it is by NW and a score of cursives?
- xiii. 18. The whole spirit of the Gospels is lost on B and on his frequent consorts CL. Here is a case. For: "*αλλ ινα η γραφη πληρωθη · ο τρωγων μετ εμου τον αρτον επηρεν* (or *επηρκεν*) *επ εμε την πτερναν αυτου*" of practically all authorities, BCL and four cursives (127\* 249 b<sup>scr</sup> 892) † *vg*<sup>T</sup> [against all Latins and *Tert*] *aeth sah [non boh] Eus*<sup>Psa</sup> [but not *Eus*<sup>dem</sup>] *Cyr*<sup>com</sup> [but not *Cyr*<sup>txt</sup>] *Origen*<sup>thrice</sup> [but against himself close by elsewhere] read *μου τον αρτον*, apparently straining after the language of *Psa. xl. 10 και γαρ ο ανθρωπος της ειρηνης μου εφ ου ελπισα, ο εσθιων αρτους μου εμεγαλυνεν επ εμε περρισμον*. But our Lord did not say "as it is written" but "in order that the scripture might be fulfilled," and if he

† plus 218 (Sod<sup>126</sup>) Sod<sup>1110 1181 1448 fam CN</sup> (and *Soden txt* *εμου* without *μετ*, evidently an error for *μου* [see his note "*μετ εμου* I *μου* etc."]).



chose to utter prophetic words, or John wrote down a wording agreeing with the fulfilment of the prophecy; would not BCL *Orig* have done well to hold to it and not to turn up the Psalm for "control." As a matter of fact B bungles another matter, for he (and he alone) writes *εμε* for *επ εμε* in the second clause, *against* the language of the Psalm. I fear *Origen* is implicated in the first misquotation, for he (once) is against himself (thrice) for *μετ εμου* with *ND unc<sup>13</sup>* and *WΨ* all minuscules (but those named), and *Paris<sup>97</sup>* it *vg Eus<sup>dem</sup> Chr<sup>bis</sup> Cyr<sup>txt</sup> Thdt<sup>bis</sup>* and all versions but *aeth sah*. In the Latin, *mecum panem* might easily have become *meum panem* with some, but it has not. Only *vg<sup>T</sup>* (possibly *vg<sup>B</sup>*) have this, while *q* has *mecum panem meum* as *E<sup>57</sup>* and four *boh* mss. I cannot enter this under Coptic, for *boh* so positively opposes *sah* which goes with BCL. It must remain a lamentable exhibition of a non-neutral text, which Hort has foisted on to us, printing the sentence in capital letters as a quotation, which it is not (for it does not even say "that the scripture may be fulfilled *which saith*," but merely "that the scripture may be fulfilled"), and failing to see the beauty of the application of the words to its fulfilment. Hort has no marginal alternative and no note in 'Select Readings,' but Souter does not feel perfectly happy about his master's wonderful methods here. While his Oxford edition of the *R.V.* keeps *μου* in the text it gives us not only *μετ εμου* in the margin, but Souter jots down the evidence besides in his note. Will he please observe now that while 892 goes with B, which he forgot to note (covering the three mss by "*al. pauc.*") that W and *Paris<sup>97</sup>* oppose, as well as *Tertullian*. And will *Soden* please to note that his text "*εμου*" is without ms support.

(The only authority to strive after verbal conformity to the LXX is *e*, which has *adimplavit* = *εμεγαλυνεν* for the *επηρεν* or *επηρκεν* of the rest. This Tischendorf does not mention nor *Soden*.)

In a case of this kind the supporting cursives should be carefully examined. He should not say "*min pauc*" but specify them. Sometimes a *mixed* band of cursives† join *Σ* or B for a reading in which some common change is judged desirable, or is the result of a common error, but this lot, 127 249 892 *b<sup>scr</sup>*, is not a common lot. In fact the only

---

† This is another point which *Soden* does not appreciate, for he omits cursives reported by *Mill*, *Wetstein* and the older collators even when B has no other support but that of these.

John

semi-outsider is b<sup>scr</sup>. The other three have definite affiliations with the B stem and the B traditions.† They have weight merely as confirming that B or the prototype of B read thus. They do not represent a separate line. 127 is a very critical codex (sometimes alone with *Origen*), 249 excessively so, and 892 is about as close a late document as we can get to B. *Soden's* added mss will also bear investigation.

Observe next that when Hort prints this as a quotation in capitals, following the form of BCL, it does not yet agree with the LXX, the printed text of which (exactly as in B's own Old Testament volume) has *αρτους μου* and not *μου τον αρτον*, so that it should not be dignified with capitals.

Another point remains to be noted. The LXX quotation closes 'επ εμε πτερνισμον' as against 'επ εμε την πτερναν αυτου.' Where was 33 above? Absent from the B ranks. But here, with 69 [non fam] 71 248 253 259 7<sup>ps</sup> *Sod*<sup>alq</sup> and *Origen* 1/4 *Eus*<sup>pas</sup> it suppresses *την* before *πτερναν* to get as near the O.T. quotation as it can. The testimony therefore of 33 here is important *against* B in the *previous* matter. Finally the *Chr* codices vary much among themselves, some following the LXX for *πτερνισμον*, showing how all turned up the passage for control. Yet none but BCL, those cursives named, *aeth sah*, one latin codex, Hort, *Soden* and the Oxford edition propose to mutilate the N.T. record.

- xvi. 13. Similarly B is implicated with all other Greeks (*ακουσει* or *ακουση*) in apparently changing the *ακουει* of *NL* [negl. *Sod L*] 33 *Ath* 1/2 *Cyr* 1/2 *b e l foss Ambr* 1/2 *slav goth sax*; as *Tisch* says "*offendebat ακουει et propter λαλησει mutandum videbatur.*" One *boh* ms and *aeth georg* have the past tense *ηκουσε*, which here properly ranks with the present as against the future. Of course it is possible to argue from a doctrinal point of view that the more authoritative present tense in speaking of the Third Person of the Trinity has been *put in* by *NL* 33, but no one of these mss is given to this kind of thing, and it may well be basic, particularly as *b* supports. I have great confidence in *b* in cases of this kind.‡ Compare the

† Observe 127 at xiv. 26/27 + *εγω* with BL alone, and note 249 in countless places.

‡ Observe in xvi. 18 the "shorter text" in *NDW fam* 1 *fam* 18 *al. pauc.* and *Paris*<sup>97</sup> of 1 - *δ λεγει* with *b a d e ff syr hier arm sah georg*, whereas B with the lonely company of 213 397 *aeth* omits *τι λαλει* at the end of the verse, which *Hort* proceeds to place in square brackets, leaving the previous *ο λεγει* to stand. What kind of "neutral" is this with only these in support? The Oxford edition removes the square bracket and scouts the idea of B's "neutrality." Another sunstroke of B, no doubt. *Soden* produces the two cursive witnesses named, viz. 213 and 397. Observe them elsewhere with B. But *Soden* does not remove *τι λαλει* on their added authority, recognising that they are of one plumage.

amplification in verse 15 *δια τουτο ειπον οτι εκ του εμου λαμβάνει* (corresponding to *ἀκούει*) *και ἀναγγελεῖ υμιν* by B and the mass.

(*℣* lacks all verse 15 from an error of homoioteleuton; *℣*<sup>o</sup> has *λημψεται* and *αναγγελλει*).

- xix. 12. *εκραυγασαν λεγοντες* (*pro* *εκραυγαζον λεγ.* *vel* *εκραζον λεγ.*)  
BD<sup>sup</sup> Ψ 33 131 157 249 435 604 *al. alig. et* *Sod*<sup>ms</sup> *et a.*

Westcott and Hort adopt this change of tense *although λεγοντες follows*, and they do it against the vast majority and against *Cyr* (*εκραζον*) and against *Origen* (*εκραυγαζον*). Wiser far are the Revisers who recall *εκραζον λεγοντες*, and *Soden* with *εκραυγαζον λεγοντες*.

*℣* has *ελεγον* for *εκρ. λεγοντες* and Paris<sup>97</sup> *εκραυγαζον* without *λεγοντες*, and 71 *εκραζον* without *λεγοντες*, none apparently *εκραυγασαν* without *λεγοντες*.

39. *ελιγμα* (*pro* *μγμα*) *℣*<sup>o</sup> BW *solī* (*e* malagmam). *℣*<sup>o</sup> corrects this. It cannot be right, although Hort has to adopt it in his text. B then substitutes a *roll* for a *mixture*. (With *℣* and W the case is not quite the same; see below). And *e* adopts a kind of half-way house with *malagmam* for *mixturam*. As to *μγμα* it is itself an *ἄπαξ λεγ.* in the N.T.: *ελιγμα* does not occur at all, and forms of *ελισσω* only twice (Heb. i. 12 *ελιξεις*, Rev. vi. 14 *ελισσομενον*). A few mss read *σμγμα*, but *Soden* cannot find any additional testimony for *ελιγμα*.

Now, while B alone has *φερων ελιγμα*, *℣* and W have *εχων ελιγμα*. This *εχων* is pure *bohairic* [against *sah ḏḥine* = *ἠνεγκε* as *sy* *pesh* and other versions]. How *εχων* of *boh* (which has *ⲟⲩⲁⲓⲧⲙⲁ*, as *sah* *ⲡⲟⲩⲁⲓⲧⲙⲁ*) came to be tacked on to *ελιγμα* and replace *φερων μγμα* of all other Greeks and all other versions would be a mystery if I had not already shown the extraordinary and hitherto unappreciated close inter-relationship of the versions with the Greek mss of Egypt. Incidentally this very *εχων* of *℣*W *boh* (*solī inter om̄n.*) is ample proof that *boh* is as old as *℣*W. They *must* have got it from *boh*. *Boh* could not have got it from them not being in close enough sympathy in the neighbourhood to warrant any accusation that *boh* had used *℣* or W in translating. And observe the *εχων* (*lit.* *cui est*) is used by *boh*<sup>om̄n</sup> † and is basic. As to *ελιγμα* substituted for *μγμα* by *℣*W, taken in connection with *εχων* substituted for *φερων*, it is clear that both *℣* and W were using some critical helps. Possibly some early Egyptian commentary explained that *μγμα*

† Only the *boh*<sup>catena</sup> *℣* has "and he brought" *ⲟⲩⲟⲩ ḏḥini* as *sah*<sup>om̄n</sup> *ḏḥine*.

involved a package of some kind and used the word *ελιγμα*. But *ελιγμα* must be wrong or it would have overflowed into the coptic. The coptic words corresponding to *μγμα* (here transliterated plainly from the Greek) are quite different.

Note. It has often been said that *W-H* have been unfairly accused of printing the readings of *B* alone. Yet here is a case in point. They print *φερων ελιγμα*, which is only read by *B*.

### Indeterminate.

John

- ii. 6. >λιθιναι υδριαι (*pro υδριαι λιθιναι*) **NBLXΨ** 33 185 314 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>541</sup> only of Greeks, plus *arm*? only of Versions, plus *c* only of Latins and *vgg aur W-H* and *Soden* texts.

This order of the ten Greeks is opposed by all other Greeks and 892, by both Coptics, by the Syriac [*hiant syr cu sin*], and by all Old Latins but *c*.

It is very clearly a question here of a real "neutral" text for **NB** (since they are agreed and supported by the subsequent copyists **LXΨ**) or of a deliberate change, for a reason which I do not understand.† *Malan* makes his *arm* codex read with them, and it is the way the *saxon* expresses it, but this is merely following vulgate order, which *St. Jerome* obtained from a codex similar to **NB**. The suspicious part is the solitary adherence of *c* [*D d* are still missing] with which even the *Aethiopic* does not agree (= *hydriae sex lapidiae*), for *c* has been tinged with much *Egyptian* revision. How is it that all the rest are opposed to these ten Greeks and *c*?

Note that **N** with *a e arm* subsequently omits *κειμεναι*. This shows that the *foundation* of the *arm* text here is similar, as well as old.

- vi. 45. The *textus receptus* reads *ο ακουσας και μαθων* (*πας ο ακουσας παρα του πατρος και μαθων ερχεται προς με*) in which it is supported by **NABCKLTH** Sod<sup>550</sup> *al. c f ff† vg Orig<sup>bis</sup> Cyr<sup>bis</sup>*, but opposed by *ο ακουων* of the rest and *a b d e g q foss gat Hil etc.* Who is right? *Tert* seems to show that he read *ακουσας*, for alluding (*Prax*) he says *Omnem qui a patre AUDISSET et DIDICISSET venire ad se*. Here it is true he reads *didicisset* into *μαθων*, whereas *μαθων* seems to imply a continuance of action.

It is a pretty place to try and settle.

† Observe that 71 348 omit *λιθιναι* and 8<sup>90</sup> omits *λιθιναι εἰς* [neither mentioned by *Tisch*]. Does this cursive (so important often elsewhere), not mentioned here by *Soden*, perchance hold the original base?

† *r* is mutilated here, although *Soden* quotes it with *c f ff*.

John

- xi. 54. I confess to the feeling of being on very tender ground here. In the final clause *κακει διετριβεν μετα των μαθητων* of most and D, with *latt*, **NBLW** only with 249 397 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>tam</sup> *N r Orig* substitute *εμεινεν* for *διετριβεν*. This is also clearly shared by *sah boh* (*aeth*?), using *ακρωπε* here (as against a different expression in iii. 22), although Tischendorf does not mention it. He remarks "*διετριβεν vero praeter hunc locum in N.T. non legitur nisi Joh iii. 22 et passim in actis.*" We have had *διετριβεν* before then in St. John at iii. 22 in exactly the same kind of phrase: "*και εκει διετριβεν μετ αυτων και εβαπτιζεν,*" but we have also had *εμεινεν* several times (iv. 40 *και εμεινεν εκει δυο ημερας*, ii. 12 *και εκει εμειναν ου πολλας ημερας*, x. 40 *και εμεινεν εκει*, and in this chapter at xi. 6 *τοτε μεν εμεινεν εν ω ην τοπω δυο ημερας*).

The double argument can therefore be drawn, first that the mass of authorities borrowed *διετριβεν* from John iii. 22 by way of improvement [but why should they *want* to improve here?], or secondly that **NBLW** recollected, preferred, or borrowed *εμεινεν* from the other passages cited. *διετριβεν* does not occur again in St. John, whereas *μένω* occurs many times (notably at xiv. 25 *ταυτα λελαληκα υμιν παρ υμιν μενων*) and is a word whose parts occur over *thirty* times in St. John's Gospel with a variety of subjects (of the Spirit at the Baptism, of the body of Jesus remaining on the cross, of the beloved disciple remaining till he came *etc.*) besides being of frequent occurrence in St. John's epistles. Therefore speaking in a Johannine way *εμεινεν* would be much more familiar to the ear than *διετριβεν*. As 249 joins the little band for *εμεινεν*, and was with them in other questionable changes in ch. xi., I incline to think that *εμεινεν* is revision of the basic text, for what purpose it is difficult to say. Certainly *διετριβεν* is the proper antithesis to *περιεπατει* at the beginning of the verse rather than the colourless *εμεινεν*. A solid consensus of *syr* and *latin* here for *διετριβεν* opposes the few Greeks with *copt* for *εμεινεν*, and Burkitt's canon here can be applied in favour of *syr* and *lat*, the more so in view of the rest of the bad record of those favouring *εμεινεν*. I have a feeling that *εμεινεν* is due to Origen's restless activity. He quotes thrice, each time with **NBLW** *εμεινεν*, just as, a little further on, at xi. 57, Origen<sup>ba</sup> with only **NBIMW** and eight cursives (so *W-H & Soden* texts) countenances the substitution of *εντολας* for *εντολην* of all other mss and all versions. **NB** Origen here mean to imply the giving of commands right and left to take our Lord, and were not satisfied with *εντολην*. Lest I should be misunderstood in saying

John

that I have a feeling about Origen deliberately making the other change, I would add that *Chrysostom*<sup>11b</sup> gives away the mental attitude involved, by confirming my views as to the second case, as he writes *και εδωκαν παραγγελιας* [*non cit. Sod*], varying the word but expressing the plural.

Westcott and Hort say nothing in 'Notes on Select Readings' about *διετριβεν/εμεινεν*—which surely is a key-note to revision on one side or the other—although in these notes on the very verse they discuss the locality of the place mentioned. Observe my remarks on xiv. 7 under "Synonyms," which throw a strong sidelight on the matter.

[Another substitution occurs at xiv. 16, of the Paraclete, where *Κ* and B and LQX, but in differing positions, substitute *ἡ* for *μένων* of most, but *μένων* here may have crept in from the *μένει* used in verse 17 following].

- xvi. 28. *εκ του πατρος* BC\*LXV? [*Sod contra Lake*]† 33 249  
*Sod*<sup>1054 1110</sup> *fam K.CN* *Epiph W-H & Sod txt.*  
*παρα του πατρος* *Κ* *rell et Ψ? minn Cyr (Chraπο) (Cf. verss)*  
 (—*εξηλθον παρα του πατρος* DW b d (e ff) ) *Cp. verse 27 and*  
*the end εξηλθον, reduplicated at the beginning of verse 28.*

### B and Origen in Conflict.

- vi. 9. *ος* BAD\*GUAWΨ *min*<sup>15</sup> *W-H & Soden, but Orig Cyr ο*  
*with Κ Sod*<sup>750</sup> *and the rest.*
50. *αποθυσηκη* B *Eus soli et W-H*<sup>ms</sup>. *Orig αποθανη* as all  
 others (but Ψ *αποληται*, and *τεθνηξεται Clem*<sup>Theodot</sup>).
52. *την σαρκα αυτου* BT<sup>1</sup> 892 { but opposed by Orig and  
*Sod*<sup>1444 8 190</sup> (*fam S*) *sah boh aeth* { *Cyr who read with the large*  
*arm syr it<sup>pl</sup> Orig<sup>int</sup> [W-H txt]* { majority *την σαρκα.*
- vii. 39. *+αγιου δεδομενου* BX<sup>b</sup> (254) *e q syr hier Orig<sup>int</sup> 1/3, but*  
*distinctly against Orig<sup>quater</sup> and Orig<sup>int</sup> elsewhere, who with*  
*ΚΚΤΗ Sod*<sup>750</sup> *Cyr Hesych add nothing. (See under "Con-*  
*flation" for further remarks.)*
- viii. 52. *θανατον ου μη θεωρηση (pro ου μη γενησθαι θανατου)* B  
 213 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Eust 32 e (sax) contra mundum et contra Orig<sup>dia</sup>.*  
*See remarks under "Improvement."*
- x. 8. *αλλ ουκ* B *omn. (αλλα ουκ DX)* but *Orig* thrice *και ουκ* with  
*Pers* only and *vg*<sup>55</sup>. *Soden* does not deign to notice this thrice  
 repeated reading of *Origen*. Why not? *Pers* [not mentioned

† I have grave doubts as to *Soden's* correctness in such places as to Ψ. Notice here in his upper notes that he adds D (*Ia*<sup>85</sup>) for *εκ του πατρος* whereas in the lower ones he admits that D with W omits the clause altogether!

by *Tiscendorf* (never quoted by *Soden*)] is a most important witness, perhaps going back of *syr sin* here.

- x. 18. *ηρεν* **NB** *solī et W-H txt*, but *Orig<sup>pluries</sup>* with all the rest *αιρει*.
41. > *εποιησεν σημειον ουδε εν* *Orig* with **KLMXII** and **WΨ** 157 and a few against *σημειον εποησεν ουδεν* of **B** and most.
- xi. 45. *και θεασαμενοι ο εποησεν* **BC\*D W-H<sup>txt</sup> & Sod<sup>1st</sup>**, but *α* *Orig<sup>pluries</sup>* with the majority.
50. *οτι συμφερει ινα εις ανθρωπος αποθανη υπερ του λαου* So **XX<sup>b</sup>** *sah<sup>ml</sup>* 252 *Thdt Chr*, as in xviii. 14, without *υμιν* or *ημιν*; but **BDLMTΓ** add *υμιν* after *συμφερει* with *Orig<sup>int</sup>*, whereas *Orig<sup>aeptles</sup>* with *Eustath* and *Cyr* is for the addition of *ημιν*, as are **AEFGHIKSUΔΔΠWΨ** *Sod<sup>250</sup> minn<sup>pl</sup> c f g r etc. sah* *syr arm aeth* and all other versions except the *itala*. As to **W** that *ms* joins the latter company and *Origen*.
53. For *συμβουλευσαντο* *Origen* witnesses twice with the mass, and but once for *εβουλευσαντο* of **NBDW** *Sod<sup>250</sup> al. duo* *Ath* (*Paris<sup>97</sup>* reads *συμβουλευσαντο*).
- xii. 15. *θυγατερ* **N** *mult et Orig<sup>lis</sup>*, *θυγατηρ* **B** *mult*.
- xiii. 2. *Origen* is on both sides many times, but, as edited, has *παραδω* against *παραδοι* of **N\*BD\*** *solī cum W-H txt* [*nil mg*].
10. *Origen* 6/7 confirms **N** and *c vg Hier Tert* for *νιψασθαι* without any addition.
11. +*οτι* before *ουχι παντες* **BCLW** 33 213 *Sod<sup>250</sup> Cyr W-H & [Sod]*, but not *Orig*.
21. > *υμιν λεγω* **B<sup>sol</sup>** *pers* (*pro λεγω υμιν rell et Ath Orig<sup>ter</sup>*). At x. 7 where **B** does the same thing *Orig* is not available; at x. 1 *Clem Cyr Chr Lucif* and *Orig<sup>int</sup>* oppose **B**.
27. -*τοτε* **NDL** 2<sup>pe</sup> *Paris<sup>97</sup>* *Sod<sup>K.C</sup> it<sup>pl</sup>* *syr sin boh* 1/3 *sah* *Cyr* and *Origen* 3/7. When he does add he says *ειτα*.
38. *εως αυ* 251 and *Origen* [*Sod* does not mention *Origen*], but *εως ου* **NB** and all except **X** = *εως* (-*ου*).  
(*Origen's* looseness is seen at xiii. 19 where he has *επαν* for *οταν* once, and xiii. 27 *ειτα* for *τοτε*).
- xv. 4. *μεινη* most and *Eus Cyr*, and *εμμεινη* *Orig*, but *μενη* **NBL** 213 *Paris<sup>97</sup>* *W-H & Sod*.
- xvi. 25. *ερχεται* (-*αλλα*) **NBC\*D\*LXYII<sup>2</sup>** and **W** 1 [*non fam*] 33 69 [*non fam*] 213 *Paris<sup>97</sup>* *Sod<sup>183 1110</sup>* *sah etc.* (see under "Coptic and Latin") but against *Orig Ath* and *Cyr*, who have *αλλα*.
- xvii. 21. *πιστευη* **N\*BC\*W** *Clem Eus W-H*, but *πιστευση* all others and *Orig Ath Cyr* and *Sod txt*.
- xviii. 6. -*οτι* **NBADLNXIIWΨ** *Sod<sup>250</sup>* but against *Orig* and *Cyr*.
- xix. 12. *εκραυγασαν λεγοντες* **BD<sup>250</sup>W** *min<sup>all</sup>* *a W-H*, but *Orig* *εκραυγazon λεγ.* with **W** and many, and *εκραζον λεγ.* *Cyr* and many.

John

- xix. 26. — *αυτου* after *τη μητρι* **NBLXWΨ** 1 22 138 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>7110 1131</sup>  
*b e Cyr W-H & Sod txt* but none of the others nor N nor  
*Origen*.
34. > *την πλευραν αυτου* *Orig<sup>bis</sup>* and 69–346 258 317 348 397 *Eust*  
 53 *bis* Paris<sup>97</sup> † only of Greeks with *lat syr*, against *αυτου την*  
*πλευραν* all other Greeks, Coptic and (*Eus*).
41. *ετεθη* nearly all and *Origen*, but **NBW** Paris<sup>97</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup> and  
*Cyr ην τεθειμενος*.
- xx. 17. > *μη απτου μου* **B<sup>sol</sup>** *Tert et verss aliq* but *Origen<sup>sexies</sup>* with  
 all others and a host of supporting Patristic testimony *μη*  
*μου απτου*.
23. *τινος bis* **B** (*sol inter gr*) *a e f syr Cypr Orig<sup>int</sup> Eus Aug*  
*Pacian Auct<sup>rom</sup>*, but against the other Latins, against all the  
 Greeks [but B] and against *Origen<sup>bis</sup> ‡ Bas Cyr<sup>hier</sup> Novat etc.*
- xxi. 23. — *αυτος* 3 250 c<sup>cr</sup>? y<sup>cr</sup> *al.?* and *Origen* with *Chr* 1/2 *Cyr* 1/2,  
 while **NBCDW** 1 33 2<sup>10</sup> *latt syr copt* place *ουτος* before *ο λογος*,  
 and the rest after it. *Origen* therefore is the most “neutral”  
 of the three groups.

---

† *Tisch* omits 258 and *Eust* 53. Paris<sup>97</sup> is new testimony.

‡ Unless *Tisch* has greatly erred. *Soden* quotes Ωρ as if *Origen*'s Greek on the side of B where *Orig<sup>int</sup>* only seems to belong.



## CHAPTER X.

"The real text of the Sacred Writers does not now, since the originals have been so long lost, lie in any ms or edition, but is dispersed in them all."—*Bentley*.

"No authority has an unvarying value, no authority is ever homogeneous."—*Westcott* ('*St. John's Gospel*,' p. xc.).

## EPILOGUE.

THE foregoing pages leave much unsaid. Many grave passages have not passed under review, because they have often been dealt with elsewhere. But the composite picture left seems absolutely opposed to a superior claim first for the shorter text; secondly for the neutral and unprejudiced text; thirdly for a text free from local preferences of grammar and syntactical structure. On the contrary, Hort's description of the ms B is contradicted again and again, and I have found him following B with additions more often than with subtractions. But enough has perhaps been said about all these matters.

What I wish to emphasise in this Epilogue is that the assumption (upon which the text of *W-H* is absolutely and indubitably founded), viz. that a conjunction of **NBL** *must* be right, carries with it the corollary that everything else—twenty uncials and the versions combined—is wrong if opposing. It seems like an unnecessary truism to state this at all. But the point involved is a grave one. It lies at the root of the whole question of textual criticism, of textual principles, and of the next revision of the Greek and English texts. To suppose that these twenty uncials and versions are wrong, when opposed to **NBL**, presupposes a most extraordinary thing. It predicates no less a theory than that they all proceed from one *erroneous revision* of the basic text of **NBL**, which is manifestly and absolutely impossible when one consults the documents themselves. The reverse is what I claim. The reverse is what I am here contending for. And the reverse is so much *easier* to understand. The aberration of **NBL** from the mass involves but one recension, and the *character* of that recension I have tried to indicate in the foregoing pages. Where **NBL** try to "improve," it must be shown that the other side, that the great mass of our other witnesses

have been deliberately revised by some one to give us a *poorer* Greek text. On the contrary, the simple testimony of these shows that the recension they represent was not striving after classical Greek expressions. Again, the other theory presupposes an *introduction* of pleonasms, which **NBL** try to remove. This carries veritable foolishness on the face of it. When **NBL** make an *addition* to improve the sense, it involves the other theory, the assumption that the mass deliberately (one and all) cut out these additions.

The foregoing pages have been wrung from me by the persistent refusal of the critics to see that an Antioch "revision" such as they suppose would have been a crazy one indeed to remove all the "good" things in **N** and/or **B**; and by their failure to appreciate that Greek-Egypt was the hot-bed of revision in the third century, continuing throughout the fourth, while poor "Antioch" pursued the even tenour of its way.

I have therefore tried to sketch, in a military way, the strength and the weakness of certain strategic positions, in the hope that light may break in on the whole position of modern criticism, so resolutely defended for 100 years by repeated *obiter dicta* but by very little else.

I had not intended at first to extend the enquiry so as to cover the history of **N** separately. But this will be found completely done (if not quite exhaustively down to every minute detail) in Part II. This study has involved over a hundred thousand checking references and the work had to be done very rapidly so as not to lose the threads and cross-threads. Personally, I have been more than repaid for the six months of hard work expended upon it, and everything I have ever contended for has found ample confirmation in the pictures painted.†

But all these minute matters, handled in both Part I. as to **B** and Part II. as to **N** *et* *rell*, only lead up to the larger questions still *sub judice* as to the omissions at Luke xxii. 43/44 and Luke xxiii. 34 which I have not discussed at all.

The minute examination however of the idiosyncracies of **N** and **B**, and the sides which they take in combination otherwise, form the necessary foundations for any deductions which are to be drawn in certain other weighty matters.

#### Luke xxii. 43/44.

The omission of the account of the bloody sweat from Luke xxii. 43/44 can safely be attributed to the transfer marks in early Lectionaries (or I should say Gospel books marked as Lectionaries) which misled some

---

† I have amalgamated some of Tischendorf's notes, thus, I hope, making matters much clearer in many places. Soden carries the *separation* of readings to such a point that it is almost impossible to regroup the passages.

scribes whose copies were already covered with textual notes† if not attributable to the influence of the docetists of Alexandria.

To this day Burkitt speaks of St. Luke xxii. 43/44 (the bloody sweat) as among "the Greater Interpolations" ['The Old Latin and the Itala,' p. 47]. The facts are all against this being considered as an Interpolation at all. But recently the Bishop of Ely (J.T.S. Jan. 1912, pp. 278/285) has provided a fresh argument for the reception of these verses as being entirely genuine, part of the record, and in the handwriting of St. Luke.‡ The Bishop has argued at length for *πρηνὴς γενόμενος* (Acts i. 18), as to Judas, being a *medical term* employed by St. Luke, meaning that "he became swollen up" as opposed to the general translation hitherto in vogue, and his view appears largely justified by the facts which he adduces. If this be the case then *καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ* stands in the same position as a *medical term* in Luke xxii. 44.

This expression medically for "becoming" is prevalent in St. Luke, just as we say "He is becoming better (or worse)," "he is becoming weaker," "he is becoming feverish," "he is becoming deaf," "he is becoming mad," "he is becoming unlike himself," "he is becoming nervous," "he is becoming crotchety," "he is becoming saner," "he is becoming tired," "he is becoming anxious," "he is becoming stupid," "he is becoming hungry" [cf. Act x. 10 *ἐγένετο δὲ πρόσπεινος καὶ ἤθελε γεύσασθαι* of Peter], "he is becoming more free from pain," "he is becoming cruel," etc. etc.

Examine St. Luke's diction for a parallel to *γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ* besides the well known one in Acts xii. 23 *καὶ γενόμενος σκωληκόβρωτος*, and we are struck at once in :

Acts xii. 11, of St. Peter, by the expression : *καὶ ὁ Πέτρος γενόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ* "coming to himself," and in :

Acts xvi. 29, of the Jailor : *καὶ ἔντρομος γενόμενος*, all three expressions involving a *mental attitude*. Note Acts xxii. 17 *γενεσθαι με ἐν ἐκστάσει*.

This is also singularly illustrated in Acts xv. 25 *γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδόν*, of the Apostles and elders of the Church being mentally "in accord."

The peculiarity of St. Luke's use of *ἐγένετο* is well illustrated at Luke xvi. 22 of the death of the beggar in the parable of Dives and Lazarus : *ἐγένετο δὲ ἀποθανεῖν τὸν πτωχόν*, as it were "finally came to the point of death" from exhaustion, whereas the rich man's death (xvi. 22) is dismissed with *ἀπέθανε δὲ καὶ ὁ πλούσιος*.

† For these *obeli*, indicative of various matters, were very liable to confusion. See p. 304 note.

‡ I am indebted to Professor Rendel Harris for pointing this out to me. Dr. Harris in his pleasant and modest manner accepts the Bishop's interpretation of *πρηνὴς γενόμενος* against his own previous view and applies it to *γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ* as another Lucan medical expression. Since this was written Dr. Harris has published a short article on the subject in the 'American Journal of Theology' for Oct. 1913.

Again, in Acts xxviii. 8 we read: ἐγένετο δὲ τὸν πατέρα τοῦ Ποπλίου πυρετοῖς καὶ δυσεντερία συνεχόμενον κατακεῖσθαι. Here again this "becoming" distinctly employed in connection with the medical terms "fever" and "dysentery." Observe that in Luke xxii. 44 καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ is followed by ἐγένετο δὲ ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ ὥσει θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.†

St. Luke uses this of our Lord's age (ii. 42) καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἐτῶν δώδεκα, "and when he reached the age of twelve."

Even of Judas the traitor, St. Luke says (vi. 16) ὃς καὶ ἐγένετο προδότης "who became a traitor," whereas Mark (iii. 19) = ὃς καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτόν, and Matthew (x. 4) = ὁ καὶ παραδούς αὐτόν.

Another apt Lucan illustration (Luke vi. 36) is the graphic γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες... καθὼς καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστί. "Become ye merciful.. even as your Father is merciful." This involves the whole Lucan vocabulary as to this medical term of *becoming*, whereas in St. Matthew (v. 48) (no exact parallel to this passage in the synoptics) the less careful expression dominant is ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν, missing St. Luke's beautiful antithesis. Similarly St. Luke at xii. 40 says καὶ ὑμεῖς (οὖν) γίνεσθε ἔτοιμοι, which is also the expression in St. Matthew.

Another mental process is involved at Luke xv. 10 οὕτω λέγω ὑμῖν γίνεται χαρὰ (or χαρὰ γίνεται) ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ... And cf. Act viii. 8 καὶ ἐγένετο χαρὰ μεγάλη ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ.

The opposite‡ is indicated at Luke xviii. 23, of the rich ruler: ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας ταῦτα περίλυπος ἐγένετο, § while St. Mark's account runs: ὁ δὲ στυγνάσας ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ ἀπῆλθεν λυπούμενος, and St. Matthew's: ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ νεανίσκος ἀπῆλθεν λυπούμενος.

Again, where another parallel is involved in the matter of the talents, St. Luke says (xix. 17) εὐ ἀγαθὲ δούλε· ὅτι ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ πιστὸς ἐγένου, ... whereas St. Matthew xxv. in both verses 21 and 23 says: εὐ δούλε... ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἢς πιστὸς.

Therefore at Luke xx. 14, where C *fam* 1 substitute ἔσται ἡ κληρονομία for γένηται ἡ κληρονομία they show an ignorance of St. Luke's Greek and have merely followed *syri*.

† Cf. Hippocr<sup>Judic</sup>: ἰδρῶς πολλὸς ἀκρῆτως γενόμενος ὑγαίνοντι νόσον σημαίνει. Hippocr<sup>Epid</sup>: ὀδοναίῳ ἰδρῶς ἐγένετο καὶ πάλιν ἐπεθέριμην ἰ πάλιν ἰδρῶς. Aristot<sup>De part animal</sup>: ἤδη δὲ τισιν ἰδρῶσαι συνίβη αιματώδει περιττώματι διὰ καχεξίαν, τοῦ μὲν σώματος βύαδος καὶ μανοῦ γινομένου, τοῦ δὲ αἵματος ἐξηγρυνθέντος δι' ἀπεψίαν, ἀδυνατούσης τῆς ἐν τοῖς φλεβίοις θερμότητος πέσσειν, δι' ὀλιγότητα. And again: (αἷματος) ἐξηγρυνωμένου δὲ λίαν νοσοῦσιν γίνεται γὰρ ἰχωροειδὲς καὶ διορρόυται οὕτως ὥστε ἤδη τινὲς ἴδισαν αιματώδη ἰδρῶτα.

‡ Observe below the contrast between φόβος εγεν. and φιλονεικία εγεν. in Luke and Acts.

§ NBL and Paris<sup>97</sup> only say ἐγενήθη, probably an "improvement." It is followed by Soden however (without new witness) as well as by W-H.

In this connection note St. John's (xvi. 20) ἀλλ' ἡ λύπη ὑμῶν εἰς χαρὰν γενήσεται.

And at Luke xx. 33 where we read ἐν τῇ οὖν ἀναστάσει τίνος αὐτῶν γίνεται γυνή, **NDG-L** *min*<sup>20</sup> show themselves in error by reading ἔσται there, as St. Matthew xxii. 28 and St. Mark xii. 23.

Yet another parallel emphasises the matter: Luke xxii. 26 we read ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως· ἀλλ' ὁ μείζων ἐν ὑμῶν γενέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος, whereas St. Matt. (xx. 26/27) and St. Mark (x. 43/44) writing more amply apply γενέσθαι το μέγας, but εἶναι both to διάκονος and δούλος.

Once more, we can point to a very exceptional passage in Luke xxiii. 24 as to Pilate: ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἐπέκρινε γενέσθαι τὸ αἴτημα αὐτῶν, again involving a mental process and not very easy to translate. A.V. has: "And Pilate gave sentence that it should be as they required," R.V.: "And Pilate gave sentence that what they asked for should be done." The Lucan phraseology covering the transaction is utterly different from that in Matt. xxvii. 24 26, or in Mark xv. 15, or in John xix. 1 4 6 8 12 14 15, and in the finale at 16.

Another peculiar expression is at Luke xxiv. 22 ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκές τινες ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξέστησαν ἡμᾶς γενόμεναι ὀρθρῖναι ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον. Quite different at Mark xvi. 1 καὶ...ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα, or Matt. xxviii. 1 ἦλθεν...θεωρῆσαι τὸν τάφον, or John xx. 1 ἔρχεται...εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον. (The exact Lucan parallel to these other passages is Luke xxiv. 1 ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα.)

For the rest observe carefully the following:

**Luke**

xxiv. 15. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ὁμιλεῖν αὐτοὺς of the disciples going to Emmaus.

51. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν αὐτόν of the ascension.

**Act**

xxvii. 36. εὐθυμοὶ δὲ γενόμενοι

xv. 39. ἐγένετο δὲ παροξυσμός

xix. 28. γενόμενοι πλήρεις θυμοῦ

( xiv. 5. ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο ὁρμὴ τῶν ἔθνων...

vi. 1. ἐγένετο γογγυσμός τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν...

xix. 23. ἐγένετο δὲ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκείνον τάραχος οἷκ ὀλίγος περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ )

**Luke**

xxiv. 5. ἐμφόβων δὲ γενομένων αὐτῶν

37. καὶ ἔμφοβοι γενομένοι

**Act**

x. 4. ἔμφοβος γενομένος

i. 19, ix. 42, xix. 17 γνωστὸν ἐγένετο

xxvii. 42. βουλὴ ἐγένετο

xv. 7. πολλῆς δὲ συζητήσεως γενομένης

xxi. 40. πολλῆς δὲ συγῆς γενομένης

xxiii. 7. ἐγένετο στάσις τῶν φάρισ.

9. ἐγένετο δὲ κραυγὴ μεγάλη

10. πολλῆς δὲ γενομένης στάσεως

Then contrast Luke i. 65 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πάντας φόβος }  
 and Act ii. 43 ἐγένετο δὲ πάση ψυχῇ φόβος }  
 v. 5 11 ἐγένετο φόβος μέγας }

with Luke xxii. 24 ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ φιλονεικία ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸ τίς  
 αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μείζων

All this has reference to mental processes. Add :

Luke  
 xxiii. 19. ὅστις ἦν διὰ στάσιν τινὰ γενομένην ἐν τῇ πόλει  
 (the other accounts differ)

Act  
 xi. 19. ἀπὸ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς γενομένης

Luke  
 vi. 48. πλημμύρας δὲ γενομένης

iv. 25. ἐγένετο λιμὸς μέγας

xv. 14. ἐγένετο λιμὸς ἰσχυρὸς (or ἰσχυρά)

Note Act xxvi. 19 βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα οὐκ ἐγενόμην ἀπειθής again of  
 the mental process ; and, of time involved :

Act  
 xx. 16. ἔκρινε γὰρ ὁ Παῦλος (cf. Luc xxiii. 24) παραπλεῦσαι τὴν Ἑφεσον,  
 ὅπως μὴ γένηται αὐτῷ χρονοτριβῆσαι ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ.

As to the proportionate use of γίνομαι and its parts in the Four  
 Gospels and Acts, note that it is used approximately 125 times in St.  
 Luke, and about 110 times in Acts, as against about 70 in St. Matthew,  
 not quite 50 in St. Mark, and about 45 in St. John.

As regards the use by the others covering a mental process the  
 occasions seem to be limited to the following :

St. Matthew  
 x. 16. γίνεσθε οὖν φρόνιμοι... } Cf. Rom. xii. 16 μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι  
 xxiv. 44. γίνεσθε ἔτοιμοι } παρ' ἑαυτοῖς  
 viii. 13. ὡς ἐπίστευσας γεννηθήτω σοι  
 ix. 29. κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν γεννηθήτω ὑμῖν  
 xv. 28. μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις ὅτι γεννηθήτω σοι ὡς θέλεις  
 xxi. 21. ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν... γενήσεται

Mark  
 vi. 26. καὶ περίλυπος γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς

John  
 xx. 27. μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος  
 † And as a semi-medical term :

Matt  
 xxviii. 4. καὶ ἐγένοντο ὡσεὶ νεκροί (or καὶ ἐγενήθησαν ὡς νεκροί) }  
 Mark  
 ix. 26. καὶ ἐγένετο ὡσεὶ νεκρός }

John  
 v. 6. θέλεις ὑγιὲς γενέσθαι ;  
 9. εὐθέως ἐγένετο ὑγιής  
 14. ἴδε ὑγιὲς γέγονας  
 ix. 39. καὶ οἱ βλέποντες τυφλοὶ γίνονται.

† Cf. Rom. vii. 13 τὸ οὖν ἀγαθὸν ἐμοὶ γέγονε (or ἐγένετο) θάνατος ;

As to the Epistles, notice

- Rom. xi. 34. τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν Κυρίου; ἢ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο;  
 1 Cor. xiv. 25. τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ φανερὰ γίνεται  
 and perhaps as a semi-medical term:  
 Phil. ii. 7. ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος  
 1 Cor. ii. 3. καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ καὶ ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἐν τρόμῳ πολλῷ  
 ἐγενόμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς  
 2 Tim. iii. 11. ... τοῖς διωγμοῖς τοῖς παθήμασιν οἳ μοι ἐγένετο ἐν  
 Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἐν Ἰκονίῳ ἐν Λύστροις.

I have been at the pains to exhibit thus fully St. Luke's partiality to the use of ἐγένετο and γενόμενος in connection with καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ for this phrase in xxii. 44 is a link of *undesigned coincidence* with his language elsewhere.

Other medical writers seem to prefer ἀγωνιῶν or ἀγωνίσας. Thus, Aristotle: διὰ τί οἱ ἀγωνιῶντες ἰδρῶσι τοὺς πόδας, τὸ δὲ πρόσωπον οὐ ... ἢ ὅτι ἡ ἀγωνία ... διὸ καὶ ὠχρῶσι τὰ πρόσωπα οἱ ἀγωνιῶντες... ποιοῦσι γὰρ τοῦτο οἱ ἀγωνιῶντες...

And Theophrastus<sup>de sudoribus</sup> ὅτι οἱ ἀγωνιῶντες τοὺς πόδας ἰδρῶσι τὸ δὲ πρόσωπον οὐ... καὶ ἀγωνιῶντες δὲ οὐ διὰ φόβον τοῦτο πάσχουσιν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ μᾶλλον ἐκθερμαίνεσθαι...

And Galen<sup>Progn. ex Puls.</sup> κίνησις ἥτισουν καὶ πάθος ψυχικὸν ὀργισθέντων ἢ φοβηθέντων ἢ ἀγωνισάντων....

So that a forger would have written at the opening of verse 44 probably καὶ ἀγωνιῶν or καὶ ἀγωνιάσας instead of καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ.

Further, note that St. Luke's ἐνισχύειν in verse 43 in the transitive sense (ᾤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν) is confined to himself and Hippocrates (ὁ δὲ χρόνος ταῦτα ἐνισχύσει πάντα).

Also note that Aristotle, in speaking of bloody sweats, uses γίνεται; and that St. Luke's expression in verse 44 of καταβαίνοντες of the drops of blood agrees absolutely with Hippocrates' language repeated often on such subjects (see Hobart, 'Med. Language of St. Luke' pp. 80/84).

### Luke xxiii. 34.

The second passage, as to the omission of the first Word from the Cross, is in a different class. And I protest most earnestly against the obiter dictum of C. H. Turner: †

"Lk. xxiii. 34 the first Saying from the Cross is  
 not part of the genuine text of St. Luke."

It is cruelly misleading the younger generation to state the matter in this offhand, not to say light-hearted way.

† J.T.S. January 1913, p. 167, note 1.

† Because BDT<sup>W</sup>N<sup>a</sup> 38 435 597 and Paris<sup>97</sup> *a d b\*\* sah boh* 1/2 *sy* *in Cyr* omit our Lord's prayer for his murderers, Turner makes this deliberate statement, which merely revives the decision of an Alexandrian school which flourished some time between 200 and 450 A.D. After Cyril of Alexandria the Church decided that the Alexandrian school was wrong, and it had rectified the matter before the time of Oecumenius.† Because Hort, basing himself on a wrong foundation, printed a text *without* this "Father forgive them for they know not what they do," Turner would assure his world through the 'Journal of Theological Studies' that the "genuine text" is without it.

It is quite unfair to render a decision or to claim a decision in this matter when the witnesses upon whom the judges rely are still under indictment for false witness in a multitude of other matters. I have put B in the dock now and accused him definitely and legally of false testimony on hundreds of counts. Let those who accept Hort's teaching get an intelligent jury to acquit B on all these counts before we can pay any attention to a claim for that ms to be heard as an authoritative witness when in a very decided minority. I wished to put my latest researches in this matter of Luke xxiii. 34 before the readers of a Theological Journal, but I was informed that if I thought that I could teach its readers anything which Hort, Swete and Turner had not taught them I was very much mistaken. Thus the Editors confessed that the matter was prejudged and that new evidence (which was what I offered upon this and upon another point) did not interest the critics. This surely is nothing short of a riot of pride and self-confidence.

As to the support which B now occasionally finds in the new ms W, it is to be remembered that W also supports ~~N~~ alone in equally important

† Add Sod<sup>960</sup> and Sod<sup>871</sup>. I think this is the full evidence to date for omission. *Soden* still cites *b* as if *b\** omitted, whereas he should know and probably does know that *Buchanan* discovered in *b\** the prayer itself, and that it was *b\*\** who had suppressed it. Further *b\** seems to give a very early and beautiful form of that Divine appeal, for *b* alone omits *γάρ*, saying:

"Pater dimitte illis! Nesciunt quid faciant," instead of:

"Πατερ ἄφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν."

*Soden*<sup>1132</sup> has:

"Πατερ ἄφες αὐτοῖς τί ποιοῦσιν" (= οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν), but otherwise the documents are agreed as to the regular form. Only A and *sy* *hier<sup>c</sup>* omit Πατερ.

*Const.* has δ ποιοῦσιν for τί ποιοῦσιν. Some Fathers (with *pere*) ἄφες αὐτοῖς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ταύτην or τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν, but retain γὰρ before οἶδασιν.

*Jacob<sup>us</sup>* is reported by *Eus<sup>2x</sup> H<sup>egesipp</sup>* as: παρακίλω κύριε θέε πάτερ ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν.

† Oecumenius' date is now fixed definitely circa 600 A.D. from his full commentary on the Apocalypse in the Messina ms No. 99. Von Gebhardt planned an edition of this but his death frustrated it. I have been instrumental in supplying Dr. F. Diekamp with photographs of the ms, and he will shortly publish an edition of it. In this *Oecumenius*, while using a text of the Apocalypse thoroughly Alexandrian, explains in his commentary that although Cyril disallowed Luke xxiii. 34 yet in his day the verse was authoritatively transmitted as genuine. See my article in the 'American Journal of Philology' for Oct. 1913.



matters, e.g. at John ix. 38/39 W<sup>N</sup> and b (l), only, omit ο δε εφη πιστευω κυριε και προσεκυνησεν αυτω και ειπεν ο ιησους. The support of b is very important here. Our Lord's speech in N<sup>W</sup> b is thus uninterrupted: (37) ειπεν αυτω ο Ιησους και εωρακας αυτον και ο λαλων μετα σου εκεινος εστιν (39) εις κριμα εγω εις τον κοσμον τουτον ηλθον... Therefore, as Hort said, N and B go apart a long way back, and neither of them is neutral.

Enough has been said, I think, to justify my contention that B is not "neutral."

I do not pursue the matter beyond the Gospels in all its detail, although many of the same features are visible in the Epistles, chiefly because, pending Mr. Horner's and Mr. White's labours on the Coptic and the Latin respectively, my materials are not complete, nor have we a complete "Old Syriac," but we can illustrate the same points, as is done beyond.

One word more here as to W. This new witness is going to take a high place among our Gospel codices and rank with D to control N and B.

I would warn the public against a feature connected with this.

When the critics who will sit in judgment on me find a place where W agrees with B, as at Luke xxiii. 34, they will exult and say: "There! You see, Hort is vindicated. W agrees with his omission which was based on N<sup>B</sup>BD *sah* (*boh*).” And they, being more convinced than ever themselves, will seek to convince you. But, be not deceived! This is merely an Egyptian excision involving W here (for observe that the only new witness lately to hand is yet another *Egyptian* codex T<sup>l</sup>). W is a weapon just as sharp to cut their theories and their readings as to support them.

When, for instance, the critics will say to you that ἐφ' ὑμᾶς by N<sup>B</sup> 892 *Sod*<sup>tribus</sup> W-H<sup>xt</sup> for "πρὸς ὑμᾶς" in Matt. x. 13 is supported by W, and therefore poor Hoskier is wasting his time talking of "pairs" in this connection and seeking to convince you that N<sup>B</sup>W were "improving," you, benevolent reader, being an independent observer, should look further, and you will then see that W does *not* support N immediately thereafter at x. 15 for +γη before γομορρων, nor does it support B at x. 16 for εἰς μεσον instead of ἐν μεσω.

In fact W generally goes against N and B much more than with them, and when it is for them the same reasons generally apply of revision of W in Egypt which caused these readings, but which did not extend to the other more radical ones.

### *Hesychius and Origen.*

Whether Dr. von Soden and Professor Sanders are justified in adopting "Hesychian" as the true name for the Egyptian recension, or whether *Origen* is the more responsible for it, cannot be determined with

accuracy. In some respects however "Hesychian" is a misnomer as we have no data to go by, whereas *Origen's* writings give us data, and the cursive mss 33 and 127 confirm the fact that *Origen* altered texts, for these two mss sometimes agree alone with *Origen* against **NB** and the rest of the Egyptian group.

*As to Dean Burgon.*

In closing let me say that Burgon's position remains absolutely unshaken.† He did not contend for acceptance of the "Textus Receptus," as has so often been scurrilously stated. He maintained that **NB** had been tampered with and revised and proved it in his 'Causes of Corruption.' He sought the truth wherever it might be recovered and did not stop at *Origen's* time. The material discovered since his day has not shaken his position at all. We seek the truth among all our witnesses, with unnecessary subservience to no one document or congeries of documents, deriving patently from a single recension. Nearly all revision appears to centre in Egypt, and to suppose all the other documents wrong when opposed to these Egyptian documents is unsound and unscientific, for we must presuppose not only "Syrian" revision but a most foolish revision which did away with these "improvements" of the Egyptians and Alexandrians, or which destroyed the "neutral" text without rhyme or reason. Have I made myself clear?

What Dean Burgon was chiefly concerned about was the lack of a scientific basis for our textual criticism. It is absolutely necessary to grasp this fact for a proper understanding of the whole matter.

A scientific basis can only be obtained after we have made ourselves masters of a scientific knowledge of the real history of transmission, and of the interaction of the versions upon each other and of the versions upon the Greek texts.

It is impossible to "revise" or compile a text from documents about which we have known so little. Every new document published helps to shed light on the ones already known. Few as have been the new editions of Greek documents, we have already been able to learn a good deal from them. Much more can be learned if we will extend our examination. It is useless to cry for more light from history, or to deplore the lack of more data than we have got from the historical writings. It is also useless to sit down and say, like some critics, that

---

† Upon two matters we must revise his position. His critics refuse to be influenced by any array of Patristic testimony against B, so that we must convict B, as I have done, in another way. Secondly, Burgon did not correctly estimate Codex D. Notwithstanding all the curious harmonies in this ms its base is profoundly ancient and important. The Latin ms b must in future be considered much more carefully than heretofore.

as history is silent on certain points we can never know more concerning these matters unless further historical documents are brought to light. Existing Sacred Manuscripts *teem* with information if we will only dig below the surface.

It is now 25 years since Dean Burgon passed away, and I ask myself what progress his opponents have made.

The answer is that after 25 years they have discovered *some* flaws in the Hort textual theory and have partially dethroned B from the paramount position it occupied in the Hort text.

There are further steps to be taken in this process, if I mistake not, and I hope that what I have written will tend further to clear the ground for a more intelligent view of the situation. The weight assigned by Burgon to Patristic testimony has been disallowed, but his indictment of B as a false witness is abundantly proved.

### *Codex B outside the Gospels.*

When we pass from the Gospels to the region of the Acts and the Epistles we subside at once into smoother waters, yet the self-same features as to B are to be observed there also. It would perhaps be tedious, although quite profitable, to follow B over all this ground. For the sake of brevity I will confine the examination to the Epistles of St. James and of 1 Peter, the latter so largely attested by sub-apostolic Fathers. We find, as I say, the same features.

As to "*forms*" and "*synonyms*" we find at :

- James  
 † i. 26. *χαλινων* (*pro χαλιναγωγων*) B only, and have to assume, if B be "neutral," that *all* others, even the closest supporters of B, use a longer synonym. The word recurs at Jas. iii. 2, *χαλιναγωγησαι*, but nowhere else in the N.T. Observe however that *Polycarp* (Phil. 5) uses *χαλιναγωγουντες*.
- iv. 9. *μετατραπητω* (*pro μεταστραφητω*) BP ac<sup>scr</sup> *Thpyl W-H*<sup>txt</sup>.  
 v. 4. *αφυστερημενος* (*pro απεστερημενος*) NB\* *solī et W-H* [*nil in mg!*]
- 1 Peter  
 i. 7. *χρυσου του απολλυμενου* B only, for *χρυσιου του απολλ.*, against all the rest and against *Clem Orig.* This tendency towards "*finessing*" remains with B to the last.  
 ii. 8. *απιστουντες* (*pro απειθουντες*) B only. (*Cf. lat.*)  
 iii. 13. *ει* (*pro ean*) B 3 101 [*non W-H*], against the rest and against *Clem Dam.* (*Soden* only mentions B).  
*ibid.* *γενοισθε* (*pro γενησθε*) B only

---

† In this very verse we find the Alexandrian preference for *εαυτου* over *αυτου* (referred to elsewhere) exhibited by BP c<sup>scr</sup> and a few of *Soden's* codices.

- <sup>1 Peter</sup>  
 iv. 5. κρινοντι (pro εχοντι κριναι) BC\*? 69 137 a<sup>scr</sup> and more of Soden. This is adopted by *W-H* without marginal alternative. The Revisers refuse to follow.  
 15. αλλοτριεπισκοπος NB d<sup>scr</sup> and more of Soden and *W-H* Sod txt (for αλλοτριο- or αλλοτριος επισκοπος)  
 17. απο ημων (pro αφ' ημων) BΨ and one cursive only [non *W-H*].

When we look further for *Coptic* sympathy, we find it at :

- <sup>1 Peter</sup>  
 i. 16. διоти γεγραπται (+στι) αχιοι εσεσθε B 31 70 *syr copt* [*W-H*]  
 ('ex ingenio linguae' as *Tisch* says)  
 Consult also :  
 v. 2. αλλα εκουσιως pro αλλ' εκ. NBΨ 68 Sod<sup>luc</sup> *W-H*.  
<sup>James</sup>  
 iii. 4. οπου (-αν) NB sah *W-H* [nil mg].

If we seek *Latin* sympathy, we find much of it :

- <sup>James</sup>  
 iv. 14. -η (ante ζωη) B only  
 ibid. -η (ante προς) BP minn<sup>5</sup> *W-H*.  
<sup>1 Peter</sup>  
 i. 21. πιστους BA vg Auct<sup>luc</sup> *W-H* against πιστευοντας  
 rel<sup>pl</sup>, πιστευσαντας aliq, et πιστευαντες Polyc.  
 22. -καθαρας BA Sod<sup>gala</sup> vg Gild *W-H* [nil mg].  
 iii. 7. -οι (ante ανδρες) B only [non *W-H*]  
 22. -του (ante θεου) N\*BΨ and *W-H*  
 v. 12. σιλβανου (pro σελουανου) B only

For further *polyglot* sympathy, consult :

- <sup>1 Peter</sup>  
 iii. 7. μη ευκοπτεσθαι ταις προσευχαις (pro μη ευκοπτ. τας προσευχας)  
 B only (*W-H* marg) with *syr lat copt*.  
 iv. 1. αμαρτιας (pro αμαρτίας) BN<sup>c</sup> *W-H* txt with *aeth vg syr*.

If we seek *change of tense*, it jumps to meet us at :

- <sup>1 Peter</sup>  
 ii. 12. εποπτευοντες (pro εποπτευσαντες) NBC aliq (vg *Cypr*) *W-H*  
 [nil mg] against the rest and against *Clem*. [Observe at iii. 2  
 εποπτευοντες by N\* only (Soden now adds some cursives.)]

Or as to *change of mood*, note :

- <sup>James</sup>  
 ii. 10. τηρηση...πταιση N(A)BC Sod<sup>gala</sup> *W-H* against the minn.

Consult also, as to *voice* :

<sup>1</sup> Peter

- i. 8. *αγαλλιατε* (*pro αγαλλιασθε*) BC\* *Sod*<sup>allq</sup> *Orig W-H*, against *tell omh Polyc Clem Cyr Thpyl* in the phrase : "*ὁν οὐκ ἰδόντες αγαπατε εἰς ὃν ἀρτί μὴ ὀρώντες πιστευόντες δε αγαλλιασθε χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλητῷ καὶ δεδοξασμένῃ*," where *αγαλλιατε* has apparently been substituted as present indicative or present imperative active to harmonise with *αγαπατε* and *ὀρώντες* and *πιστευόντες*, as against *αγαλλιασθε* as present indicative or subjunctive or imperative of the middle voice. *Origen* is implicated here against the other strong Patristic testimony.

For another case of *Origenistic* influence, observe :

<sup>1</sup> Peter

- v. 8. *-τινα* BΨ *Sod*<sup>74</sup> only with *Orig*<sup>int</sup> and *W-H txt*, against the rest, *Orig* himself and many Fathers.

*Choice exercised by W-H as to the B readings.*

The choices of Hort when B is alone are quite curious. He follows above, and at :

<sup>1</sup> Peter

- † iv. 19. *τας ψυχας* (*-αυτων*) B only and *W-H txt* [*Soden* adds nothing], but refuses to follow lots of other peculiarities of B, as :

James

- ii. 4. *-ου* B\* *Sod*<sup>allq</sup> *ff* (an "improvement" ? against MSS and versions)
- iii. 4. *+τα* (*ante τηλικαυτα*) B only ("Improvement")
- v. 14. *-του κυριου* B only, which might possibly be "neutral" [yet more probably to be considered an amendment. Cf. *Acts* v. 41 "to suffer for the name"] which *W-H* only include in square brackets.

<sup>1</sup> Peter

- i. 1. *-και βιθυνιας* B\* only with *Sod*<sup>74</sup>
- ii. 1. *φονους* (*pro φθονους*) B only with *Sod*<sup>74</sup>
6. *-επ αυτω* B only
24. *υμων* (*pro ημων*) B *Sod*<sup>allq</sup> (*W-H mg*) against the rest and *Polyc*.
25. *-ητε γαρ* B only and *q*.
- iii. 18. *-τω θεω* B only

† Observe here against all the rest *τας ψυχας αυτων* as *N plur*, or *τας ψυχας εαυτων* as some *minn*, or *τας εαυτων ψυχας* in the coptic manner with 531 and *Athanasius*.

Not even in a doctrinal matter do *W-H* follow B at :

<sup>1 Peter</sup>

- i. 11. πνευμα (-χριστου) B only with *Athanasius* according to *Soden* (but *Χριστου* is not omitted in the Benedictine edition of 1698) (against all and *Ignat*).

But if B is right at 1 Peter iv. 19, v. 8, why not in these other places ?

Further, we can show you here even (cramped as we are by our self-imposed limitations) *harmony and accommodation to the LXX on the part of B*. For, observe :

<sup>1 Peter</sup>

- ii. 6. ακρογωνιαιον post εκλεκτον BC 31 *Sod*<sup>allq</sup> *copt arm Barn Cyr* *W-H* = order of LXX against our other New Testament witnesses which place it before εκλεκτον.  
*ibid.* -επ αυτω B (which *W-H* refuse to follow) is against the rest, and against *Barn επ αυτον*, and *Eus Cyr εις αυτον*. Again possibly from his text of the LXX.  
 iv. 18. ο δε ασεβης B\* 137 *Sod*<sup>allq</sup> [*W-H*]. Cf. LXX.

*A matter of order further concerns the Latin :*

<sup>1 Peter</sup>

- iii. 4. >ησυχιου και πραεως (*pro* *πρα. και ησυχ.*) B only with *m q vg* *Aug Ambr* and *W-H txt*.

But in adopting this did not Hort see that he was using version support and that it was not the "neutral" text ?

These few words must suffice here to indicate that the general character of the B recension remains the same *outside* the Gospels as *inside*. The same desire for individuality at the expense of truth, the same ideas of finessing, the same ideas of harmony, occasional bold excisions, and distinct version sympathy which is clearly *non-neutral*, against *Barnabas*, *Polycarp* and *Clement of Alexandria*.

*Ignatius, Clement of Rome, Hermas, Polycarp, Justin, opposed to B :*

Even as to the bold excision at 1 Peter i. 11 as to the spirit of *Christ* dwelling in the prophets of old, observe that B doubtless opposes the copy of the scriptures in *Ignatius'* library [this name is not mentioned with *Did Ath Cyr*<sup>hier</sup> and *Cyr*<sup>Alex</sup> by Tischendorf nor indeed in Jacobsen's edition of *Ignatius*] for *Ign*<sup>lib</sup> says (*ad Magnesianos* § viii.) οἱ γὰρ θειότατοι προφῆται κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἔξησαν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐδιώχθησαν, ἐνπνεόμενοι ὑπὸ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ πληροφορηθῆναι τοὺς

ἀπειθούντας... Here von Soden now adds *Athanasius* to B for omission of Χριστον. If this be so as to *Ath*<sup>codd</sup> it is a wonderful commentary upon the junction of B and *Alexandria*. (In the Benedictine edition of 1698 of *Ath. Χριστον* is found.)

Again when we consult *Clement of Rome* (I. 34) we find that he quotes the passage in 1 Cor. ii. 9 as "λέγει γάρ ὁφθαλμοὺς οὐκ εἶδεν, καὶ οὐς οὐκ ἤκουσεν, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ὅσα ἠτοίμασεν τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτόν."

While ABC agree as to the *οσα* of *Clem*<sup>Ro</sup> for *α* of the rest, they have, like the other MSS, ἀγαπῶσιν and not ὑπομένουσιν. Had B exhibited ὑπομενουσιν we might have thought indeed that the conjunction of B and *Clem*<sup>Ro</sup> indicated a "neutral" text.

In the reference to this passage in *Polycarp*<sup>mart</sup> the matter is as follows :

Πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν γὰρ εἶχον φυγεῖν τὸ αἰώνιον καὶ μηδέποτε σβεννύμενον πῦρ, καὶ τοῖς τῆς καρδίας ὀφθαλμοῖς ἀνέβλεπον τὰ τηρούμενα τοῖς ὑπομείναισιν ἀγαθὰ, ἀ οὔτε οὐς ἤκουσεν, οὔτε ὀφθαλμοὺς ἶδεν, οὔτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη (leaving out the last clause here, as in *Clem*<sup>Ro</sup> II. 11) ἐκείνους δὲ ὑπεδείκνυτο ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, οἵπερ μηκέτι ἄνθρωποι ἀλλ' ἤδη ἄγγελοι ἦσαν. The passage continues : 'Ομοίως δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰ θηρία κριθέντες ὑπέμειναν δεινὰς καλᾶσεις, κήρυκας μὲν ὑποστρωννύμενοι καὶ ἄλλαις ποικίλαις βασάνοις... where it will be observed that the expression *υπεμειναν* finds a place.

Similarly at 1 Cor. iv. 4 where the phrase ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ δεδικαίωμαι is quoted by *Clem*<sup>Ro</sup> as ἀλλ' οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο δεδικαίωμαι we do not find that B agrees.

Or at Hebr. i. 4 for τοσούτω κρείττων *Clem*<sup>Ro</sup> (I. 36) has τοσούτω μείζων. Not so B, although B elides των before ἀγγελων with *Clem*<sup>Ro</sup>.

Or at Hebr. iii. 5 if B added *θεραπων* as does *Clem*<sup>Ro</sup> after πιστος as to Moses we might presuppose a common "neutral" original.

(Of course we have to make allowances for Clement's fusion of different parts as in I. 36 Heb. viii. 1-3 is merged with Heb. iv. 15 quite *libere*.)

At Matt. x. 16 B finesses with εἰς μεσον λυκῶν for ἐν μεσῷ λυκῶν of the rest, undoubtedly because the words follow the verb of action ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς. He does not do it in the parallel at Luke x. 3, but there D is found with μεσον for ἐν μεσῷ. A reference to *Clem*<sup>Ro</sup> (Epist. II. v.) would seem to show that *his* copy of the Scriptures agreed with our general authorities against both B and D. Hence B and D are opposing the "neutral" text instead of preserving it.

Again, for ἄδικοι in 1 Cor. vi. 9 we find οἱ οἰκοφθόροι in *Ignatius* (Eph. 16). There is no trace of this in B.

At *Ephes* v. 25 where we read οἱ ἄνδρες ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναῖκας καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, we find the counterpart in *Ignatius* (ad *Polyc* 5) but *Ignatius* substitutes τὰς συμβίλους for τὰς γυναῖκας. No

trace in B. Further, if B, as *Polycarp*, read *αδου* for *θανατου* in Act ii. 24, we might infer a "neutral" text for B. But it is D and Latin which agree with *Polycarp* as also *Iren<sup>int</sup>* *Epiph Pseud-Ath Thdt* and *Fac*.

Again, Act xxi. 14 *Polyc<sup>mart</sup>* has το θελημα του θεου γενεσθω, which is the reading of D<sup>st</sup> [neglected by *von Soden*] and *Tert* 1/2, while most read with *Tert* 1/2 the same order το θελημα του κυριου γενεσθω, but *NABCE* are furthest away with the order του κυριου το θελημα γινεσθω.

Again, B opposes *Polycarp* at 1 Jo. iv. 3 omitting εν σαρκι εληλυθοτα, whereas *Polycarp* distinctly says: πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, ἀντίχριστός ἐστι. Notwithstanding this, *W-H* omit [without a word in the margin] and *Soden* brackets it in his text and does not say a word about *Polycarp* in his notes.

As showing that *Polycarp* was really quoting 1 Jo. iv. 3 as it stood in his copy of the Epistle, he follows it by quoting part of 1 Jo. iv. 9 in the very next section (viii.) of his letter to the Philippians.

*Hermas*, close to James iv. 7 "ἀντίστητε (δὲ) τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ φεύξεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν," says: ἐὰν οὖν ἀντιστῇς αὐτὸν νικηθεὶς φεύξεται ἀπὸ σοῦ κατησχυμμένος.

Had we found κατησχυμμένος in B we might certainly think we had a separate relic of an ancient text, but such evidences are not forthcoming.

*Justin<sup>trypho</sup>*, referring to Matt. vii. 15, says: εἶπε γὰρ πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἔξωθεν ἐνδεδυμένοι δέρματα προβάτων, ἔσωθεν δὲ εἰσι λύκοι ἄρπαγες.

If we found ἔξωθεν in B we might consider it "neutral" or basic, but we do not find it. For *Justin* repeats the full verse (after interposing 1 Cor. xi. 18): προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν οἵτινες ἐλεύσονται πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔξωθεν ἐνδεδυμένοι δέρματα προβάτων ἔσωθεν δὲ εἰσι λύκοι ἄρπαγες again using ἔξωθεν. In both cases *Justin* uses ἐνδεδυμένοι δέρματα προβάτων for the usual ἐν ἐνδύμασιν προβάτων.

Notice that *Justin* seems to be quoting from his copy of the Scriptures and not entirely from memory, for when he deals with Mark viii. 31, which he does twice at considerable intervals, he substitutes in both places καὶ σταυρωθῆναι for καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι. The same remark applies to *Justin*'s twofold quotation of Mark viii. 11/12.

Also at Luke xi. 52 notice εχετε of *Justin*. If we found this (instead of ηρατε, or εκρυψατε D 157 a c d syr cu sin diatess) we might then recognise it as a "neutral," for *Marcion* and *Tertullian* appear to agree with *Justin*, and it is repeated by *Ambrst Aug* and *Auct<sup>quæst</sup>*, although not exhibited by *Tischendorf* or *Soden*.

### "Higher" and "Lower" Criticism.

Finally, observe that up to the time of Westcott and Hort the "lower criticism" had kept itself quite apart from so-called "higher criticism." Since the publication of Hort's text, however, and of that



of the Revisers, much of the heresy of our time has fallen back upon the supposed results acquired by the "lower criticism" to bolster up their views. By a policy of indecision in the matter of the fundamental truths of the Christian religion—truths specifically set forth by its Founder,—and by a decided policy, on the other hand, of decision in the matter of heresy in the field of lower criticism, the beliefs of many have been shaken not only to their foundations, but they have been offered free scope to play the Marcion and excise whatever appeared extra-ordinary or unintelligible to them. Many, who should have raised their voices against the mischief wrought, have sat by in apathy or have wilfully fostered these heresies. Or, if not wilfully, they have assumed a faltering attitude which caused their own students to misinterpret their masters' lessons. Thus we have the spectacle of Thompson and Lake saying to Sanday: "We learned that from you," and Sanday retorting: "I never meant to teach you that."

A man like the Dean of Durham, not content with preaching Christmas sermons at Westminster attacking the Virgin-birth, and vapouring in the United States about the close atmosphere of theological seminaries which he would like to burn to the ground, has now† decided to introduce the "Revised Version" officially into the lectern of the ancient cathedral of Durham. I am therefore correct in coupling these matters.

Reiteration of Hort's dicta by his followers is not proof. Let someone take the dozen "Alexandrian" readings of B which I have adduced—the existence of which in B was denied by Hort—and prove that they are in no wise Alexandrian. Then we can discuss the matter further. Mr. Horner asked me why I had neglected *Athanasius'* testimony in my volume upon the date of the Bohairic version. I told him, first because the editions of Athanasius were unsatisfactory, and secondly because the matter of Athanasius and Alexandria belonged as much or more to B as to *Σ*.

Let somebody explain how B comes to oppose the sub-apostolic Fathers, deliberately in places, if we are to accept Hort's assurance about B being "neutral." Until that is done, let us away with "*dicta*" and go by proof.

### *Further Test of a Neutral Text.*

#### ARISTIDES.

The previous exhibit has carried us up to a certain point, but the study would not be complete without a few words more as to what *would* really constitute a "neutral" text in B or *Σ*.

---

† "Dean Hensley Henson, just promoted to Durham, has announced that the Revised Version of the Bible will in future be used in the Cathedral."—*Public Opinion*, April 4, 1918.

And first, let us assume that B or  $\aleph$  exhibited a foundation text approximating the quotations from or wording of such a document as the second-century *Apology of Aristides*, for the Greek of which see the Dean of Wells' edition in 'Texts and Studies,' vol. i., No. 1. Were that the case, we should be compelled to look upon the matter very differently. If, for instance, at 2 Cor. ix. 7, we found ἀνεπιφθονως† for (μη) ἐξ ἀνάγκης we might well say that we had found a "neutral" text quite different from later ones, but such a thing is not found in  $\aleph$  or B.

Similarly if in *Titus* ii. 12 we should read in B ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως ζῶντες as Aristides (§ xv. 18) ‡ instead of σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζήσωμεν we should certainly see a foundation text of the time of Aristides, but we do not find this. ||

The only result of such a comparison is the wonderment which it engenders in us that Christianity had already so filled men's minds that, having read the Christian writings, as he says he had (mentioned in close connection with these passages), such language, close to but not exactly scriptural, should issue from his mouth. ¶ The picture from Aristides' pen (or that of his chronicler) is one of the most beautiful in the world as a comment on the early Christian order and the execution by its votaries of the Master's maxims and of the words of his apostles, and it goes far to explain the mental attitude of the apostolic and sub-apostolic Fathers and their circumlocutory quotations of New Testament Scripture. They were so steeped in the maxims and practices of the cult that words flowed from their lips and their pens close to but not verbally exact as to Scriptural diction. They were permeated with the spirit of Christianity and "the letter" was flexible in their hands.

#### THEODOTUS (circa 190).

To take a more positive example, after the above negative exhibition, let us consider other early witnesses, and first as to *Luke* ix. 27, always a difficult text, and a "rock of offence" to many. We will ask what *Theodotus* read there. Tischendorf does not give his testimony under *Luke*. I extract it from *Theodoti Eclogae* (Fabric. Bibl. Gr. vol. v. p. 136) where we read :

---

† Aristides (§ xv. 12) is speaking of: "and he who has gives to him who has not without grudging." He is referring to what he saw as the outcome of the Pauline maxim in 2 Cor. ix. 9 (Ps. cxii. 9).

‡ The preaching of Peter (*Clem Strom* vi. 39) has οσίως καὶ δικαίως μανθανόντες which is not as close to *Titus* as *Aristides*.

|| *Soden* quotes *Aristides' order*: " ~ εὐσ...δικ. I<sup>a</sup> 2173 Kv'."

¶ Had the apology been forged it is impossible to conceive that the late forger would not have incorporated actual phrases from the N.T. instead of the smoother picture conveyed by the Athenian philosopher.

εἰσὶ τινες τῶν ὧδε ἐστηκότων ὃ (sic) οὐ μὴ γεύσονται θανάτου ἕως ἂν ἴδωσι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν δόξῃ.

NB do not read thus, but D and *Origen* (του δε λουκα:—) read τον υιον του ανθρωπου ερχομενον εν τη δοξη αυτου.

NB therefore oppose *Origen* here and D. *Origen* seems to be definite as to his reading being from Luke. True, we read ὧδε for αυτου [the regular text is εἰσὶν τινες τῶν αὐτοῦ ἐστηκότων οἱ οὐ μὴ γεύσονται θανάτου ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ in Luke] and ὧδε is read in *Matt* xvi. 28 (but *Epiph*an there αυτου and *Mark* ix. 1), but ἐστωτων or ἐστωτες is the regular reading in Matthew.

In Matthew *Origen* reads ερχ. εν τη βασιλεια αυτου (η) εν τη δοξη αυτου bis.

The regular text is (τον υιον του ανθρωπου) ερχομενον εν τη βασιλεια αυτου.

№ 38 113 245 435 y<sup>ex</sup> a copt Basil and *Epiph*<sup>val</sup> read ερχ. εν τη δοξη αυτου.

The *Theodotus* or *Valentinian* quotation therefore remains the shortest, being without ερχομενον and without αυτου fin, and conveying a very different sense.†

Now elsewhere *Origen* has said that "he knows of no others who have altered the Gospel save the followers of Marcion and those of Valentinus," but here he goes with the very text as upheld by the latter.

Have we got the true text in №B? We have certainly not re-established the Origenian reading.

#### HERACLEON† (circa 170).

Or consult *John* iv. 18 as to the woman of Samaria, where *Heracleon* would have it that she had had six husbands instead of five. If B showed this we might say it was certainly a second-century text.

#### ATHENAGORAS (circa 175).

Or, consult 2 *Cor* v. 10 in connection with *Athenagoras*<sup>de reurr.</sup> Upon opening Tischendorf a wide difference of opinion is visible, not only among the Fathers, but between № and B, for № prefers αγαθον ειτε φ αυλον with *Orig*<sup>seples</sup> while B writes αγαθον ειτε κακον with *Orig*<sup>bis</sup>, but *Athenagoras* says neither; he writes:

ἐκαστος κομίσηται δικαίως ἃ διὰ τοῦ σώματος ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὰ εἴτε κακά.

† In all three synoptics the account of the Transfiguration immediately follows. So that *Theodotus* follows his quotation by saying: εἶδον οὖν καὶ ἐκοιμήθησάν ὃ, τε πέτρος καὶ ἰάκωβος καὶ ἰωάννης, without the slightest discussion of a various reading, except what might possibly be inferred from "καὶ τὸ ἐνταῦθα ὀφθέν οὐχ' ὕστερον τοῦ ἄνω κ.τ.λ."

‡ See beyond under the heading of "Marcion" for further examples.

This seems rather an interesting place, for Tischendorf does not refer to the addition here of *δικαίως* by *Athenag.* It should be considered in connection with the variety of reading of *τα δια του σωματος* of the ordinary text and *Clem Orig*<sup>septicis et int al.</sup> on the one hand, and *τα ιδία τα σωματα* on the other hand of *d e f g vg goth arm Orig*<sup>bis et int al.</sup> and *Zeno* "corporis sui merita."

(*Athenag* has a curious addition also in 1 Cor xv. 53 for which I know of no other authority: "ὅτι δεῖ (κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον) τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο καὶ διασκεδαστὸν ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθρασίαν...")

In that very difficult text *Matt* v. 28, in which to know what was first written seems impossible, **Σ** and **B** divide.

τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι **Σ**\* 236 *Clem Orig*<sup>tr</sup> *Quaest*<sup>ant</sup> *Isid Tert*<sup>pl</sup>

τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν **B** mult *Thpl Orig*<sup>sem</sup> *Eus Const Ps-Ath*

τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς **Σ**<sup>b</sup> *M al. Just Athenag Orig*<sup>sem</sup>

and we find **Σ**<sup>b</sup> with *Justin* and *Athenagoras* (*latt*) but *Ephr* goes with **Σ**\* and *Clem.* (*Ephr* quicumque aspicit et concupiscit tantum). (*Athenagoras* alone seems to use the perfect here *μεμοίχευκεν* for *ἐμοίχευσεν*.)

In this verse for the varieties *βλεπων, εμβλεπων, βλεψας, εμβλεψας, οστις εμβλεπει, ος αν εμβλεψη*, it is *Theophilus*, another second-century witness, who exhibits the simple *ιδων*.

In *Matt* v. 44/45 on the other hand we find *Athenagoras* solely with *latin* [not *d k*] *syriac Naass Clem*<sup>hom</sup> *Iren*<sup>int</sup> and *Tert*, against **ΣB** and the Greeks, giving us a serious variation in *verse* 45 of *ὅπως γέννησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ὃς τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει κ.τ.λ.*

This *ὃς* of *Athenag* replaces the *ὅτι* of the Greeks and *d k*, and with *Naass* (both second-century witnesses) quite neutralises the witness of the rest.

(*Justin*<sup>Apol</sup> has...καὶ τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει... (*libere*), but *Just*<sup>trypho</sup>...τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλοντα.)

Here the new editor *von Soden* springs a surprise on us; he makes a warranted and rather welcome, if bold and unusual departure from recent critical rules, by taking *ὃς* into his text (to the exclusion of *οτι*) without Greek ms support for *ὃς*. He says in his upper notes: "*οτι* 1 *os I-H-K gg Mp Iou Ta Athn Ir ψΚλ Tert Ωρ Hil Luc Naass Man sy pa?* lat<sup>exo k</sup>, *οστις Ir*<sup>6398 370f 1443</sup> *Ευσ*," supplying Greek ms witnesses for *οστις* but not *ος*. *Tertullian* should be consulted in full however for he quotes in different ways, and once (*contra Marcion* 1/2) "*pluentem*..." exactly as *Justin*<sup>trypho</sup> *ανατέλλοντα*.

#### THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH (circa 180).

*Theophilus*<sup>ad autol. lll. xiv</sup>, after a quotation from Isaiah, adds from *Matt* v. 44/46: τὸ δὲ εὐαγγέλιον: ἀγαπᾶτε, φησί, τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεάζοντων ὑμᾶς· ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας

ὁμᾶς ποῖον μισθὸν ἔχετε; So far, observe, with the general run of authorities, except for ἀγαπάτε (instead of ἀγαπήσητε) with 1 some cursives *Justin Athenag* (as Luke), and ποῖον (for τινα, so *Athenag*) with no others apparently, but compare Luke vi. 33 ποῖα as *Evst* 50 here in Matthew.

But now he continues: τοῦτο καὶ οἱ λησταὶ καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ποιοῦσι. The exact wording does not matter so much as that instead of the question of most: οὐχι καὶ οἱ τελῶναι οὕτως ποιοῦσι, with *Theophilus* it assumes the form of a statement.

Does B agree? No, B does not. But *ℵ* does, and so does *boh* (that despised late *boh*!) and so does *syr sin* and practically *syr cu*, confirmed by *Aphraates*, and by the *persian* version as well.

This form obtains in Luke vi. 33 καὶ οἱ ἀμαρτωλοὶ το αὐτο ποιουσιν, but *ℵ* does not draw from Luke since he uses the rest of the Matthaean terminology. Cf. Merx *ad loc.* pp. 107/119 and note what he says on p. 119. Merx neglects *Theophilus* but mentions *Justin's* καὶ γὰρ οἱ πόρνοι τοῦτο ποιοῦσι, also deliberately in the form of a statement, quite neglecting the οὐχι. Observe verse 47 in this connection whence οὐχι probably ascended to the verse above.

#### NAASSENI (circa 200).

Or take another early series of witnesses. In *John* x. 9 *Naass*<sup>Hipp</sup> are reported for "δια τουτου φησι λεγει ο ιησους · εγω ειμι η πυλη η αληθινη." Had this attribute of πυλη been found in B we might think we had recovered something ancient.

#### HIPPOLYTUS. (circa 220).

All this may be said to be very fragmentary evidence and open to the objection of memorial quotations.

Very well. Let us take another most interesting witness, viz. *Hippolytus*, who, like *Lucifer*, frequently quotes at such length from both Old and New Testaments that it is absolutely beyond question that he was copying from his exemplar of the Scriptures.

*Hippolytus* cites 1 *Thess.* iv. 13-17, 2 *Thess.* ii. 1-12, in full.†

---

† It is a remarkable thing that *Hippolytus* has transmitted to us his text of 2 *Thess.* ii. 1-12, for these verses contain a detailed prophetic utterance by St. Paul concerning the history of the last times and of Christ's coming again to displace the lawless one (ὁ ἀνομος), and every word therefore is precious, down to the important πέμψει or πέμψει of verse 11. *Hipp.* maintains πέμψει, against *ℵB*, and has the support in another language of *Cornelius* (Pope A.D. 252) and of *Victorin* (A.D. 294), both writing at length on the subject, with *mittet*. Similarly *Victorin* confirms της αμαρτίας of *Hipp.* with peccati in verse 8 where *Cornelius* does not quote.

In the face of these quotations it is seen how loosely Turner argues when he says "Hort was the last and perhaps the ablest of a long line of editors of the Greek Testament, commencing in the eighteenth century, who very tentatively at first, but quite ruthlessly in the end, *threw over the* LATER *in favour of the* EARLIER Greek MSS, and that issue will never have to be tried again."

But permit me to ask what Mr. Turner means by this light-hearted sentence. What does he mean by earlier and later Manuscripts? He cannot mean that Hippolytus' manuscript was later than that of B? Yet, allow me to state that in these long passages, comprising twelve consecutive verses from one epistle and four from the other, *Hippolytus'* early third-century ms† is found generally on the side of what Turner would call the "later" mss. Has he ever consulted these important passages before writing down so positively statements which seem to me to be extremely misleading?

The matter, in detail, reduces itself to this:

<sup>1</sup> Thess.

iv. 13. It is the cursives 31 and 73 with *demid* which omit *αδελφοι* as does *Hipp*.

*ibid.* *Hipp* has *κεκοιμημενων* with DEFGKL *plur* and other Fathers, against the *κοιμωμενων* of *ΣAB* etc.

*ibid.* *Hipp*(?) has *ως* with *ΣD\*FG* 47 *Orig Bas*, against *καθως* of *Σ\*B* *rell*.

14. *Hipp* has *και ο θεος* with the mass, against *ο θεος και* of B, now supported by other of *Soden's* codices.

17. *Hipp* has *περιλειπομενοι* with the mass, against B's *περιλειμενοι*.

*ibid.* *Hipp* has *συν Κυριω* with the mass and *Orig Eus*, against B's improvisation of *εν Κυριω*.

<sup>2</sup> Thess.

ii. 1. *Hipp* has *του Κυριου ημων* with the mass and *Orig Tert*, while B omits *ημων*.

3. *Hipp* has *της αμαρτίας* with ADEFGKLP *minn*<sup>pl</sup> *verss*<sup>pl</sup> *Orig* 4/5 *Orig*<sup>int</sup> *Eus Chr Thdt Dam Iren*<sup>int</sup> *Aug*, against *της ανομίας* of *ΣB* *minn*<sup>9</sup> *Sod*<sup>ailq</sup> *sah boh Orig* 1/5 *Tert (Ambr Ambrst)*.

The non-agreement of *Origen's* quotations, with preponderance against *ΣB*, the adhesion of the Coptic versions, and the way in which *Epiph* turns it (*ο υιος της ανομίας ο ανθρωπος της αδικίας*) taken in connection with *ανομίας* and *ανομος* in verses 7 and 8, all point to revision by *ΣB*, in which *Hipp* does not share. It is the usual "Egyptian" revision, for *Latins* and *Syriac Goth* and *Aeth* go with *Hipp* and the mass.

---

† Or very likely a second-century text.

Note in verse 12 **NB** with *Origen* write *αλλα ευδοκησαντες*, instead of *αλλ' ευδοκ.*, conforming to the usual Coptic or Egyptian method.

<sup>2</sup> *Thess.*

- ii. 4. *Hipp* with **FG Orig** 5/7 *Procop* 1/2 has *και επαιρομενος*, against *και υπεραιρομενος* **N<sup>\*</sup>B Orig** 2/7 and most (**N<sup>\*</sup>** omits).
8. *Hipp* has *ο κυριος Ιησους* with **NAD<sup>\*</sup>E<sup>\*</sup>FGL<sup>\*\*</sup>P etc.** and most Fathers, against *ο κυριος* of **BD<sup>c</sup>E<sup>\*\*</sup>KL<sup>\*</sup> etc.**
10. *Hipp* has *της αδικιας* with **N<sup>c</sup>DEKLP al. pl.** against *αδικιας* of **N<sup>\*</sup>ABFG al. pauc. Orig etc.**
- ibid.* *Hipp* has *εν τοις απολλυμενοις* with **N<sup>c</sup>D<sup>c</sup>EKL al. pl.** against *τοις απολλ.* of **N<sup>\*</sup>ABDFG** (*Orig* is on both sides here, as so often).
11. *Hipp* has *πεμφει* with **N<sup>c</sup>D<sup>c</sup>EKLP al. pl** and other Fathers, against *πεμπει* of **N<sup>\*</sup>ABD<sup>st</sup>F<sup>st</sup>** (*Orig* again divided).

Thus, there is no such thing as "earlier" and "later" mss in this connection. Hippolytus' ms was "early" enough to be of service here and to indicate that what Turner (and others) would designate the readings and leanings of "the later mss" are not "later" at all, but go to the second century or at latest to the first quarter of the third century. The question is not at all of "earlier" or "later" mss, but as to which of two readings current in the second century was the correct one. And as to this B evidently has no more to say than F.

If we seek a "neutral" base in B, why does B not convey the "shorter" text with *Hipp*, as at

1 *Thess.* iv. 16 where he omits *αρχαγγελου*, or

2 *Thess.* ii. 10    "    "    "    *εις το σωθηναι αυτους* ?

### MARCION.

Let us enquire for a moment further in a region where *Marcion's* testimony is available what the situation is there. We will take the first half of St. Luke's Gospel so as not to be too wordy, ch. i.-xii. Let us see how far any proof offers of B being really "neutral." Hereabouts also *Clem<sup>Alex</sup>* and others offer valuable testimony.

And first:

If with **NL** at *Luke* ii. 44 B omitted *και τοις γνωστοις*, we might call it "neutral," because *Ev Thom* also omits.

Or at iii. 16 if B omitted *αυτος* as do **N<sup>\*</sup>** and *Heracl* (*ex Clem<sup>ec.05</sup>*). For observe that **NB** agree with *Heracl* (*Clem*) in the next verse, iii. 17, for *διακαθαραι* instead of *και διακαθαριει*.

Or at iv. 19 where the quotation from Isaiah is cut short by *Evst* 34 *Origen* and *Athan* (these not noticed by *Soden*) who omit *αποστειλαι το δεκτον*, but not B. Had B cut this short, we could presuppose a shortened basic "neutral" form reproduced by B and added to by others, but it is not so.

Or at v. 14 *fin.* where *Epiph* and *Tert* disagree as to *Marcion's* text. Had B given us *υμιν* before *εις μαρτυριον αυτοις* of most as *Epiph*<sup>dis</sup> (or *ινα εις μαρτυριον η υμειν τουτο* as D<sup>st</sup> and other Latins and *Tert*<sup>marc</sup>) we might consider this neutral.

Or at v. 36 where *Dial* twice gives (*επι*) *ιματιω παλαιω* confirmed by *Epiph*<sup>marc</sup> to which agree MΓ 122 (elsewhere 122 goes with B) 301 406 f<sup>cr</sup> *a b Tert*<sup>marc</sup>,† but not B who has *επι ιματιον παλαιον* with most. As to *επι* with the dative consult Winer, Eng. edition, pp. 488 seq.

Or at vi. 9 where *Tert*<sup>marc</sup> has "*Licetne sabbatis benefacere annon*" for *ει εξεστιν τω σαββατω αγαθοποιησαι η κακοποιησαι*, but B shows no sign of this *η ου*.

Or at vi. 22 where *Clem*<sup>Alex</sup> has a shortened and graphic form, "*μακαριοι εστε οταν οι ανθρωποι μισησωσιν υμας, οταν αφορισωσιν, οταν εκβαλωσι το ονομα υμων ως πονηρον ενεκα υιου ανθρωπου*," but not so B. There must be some basis for the omission of *και ονειδισωσιν*, for the order varies in others, *Tert*<sup>marc</sup> confirming *ονειδ. και εκβαλ.* while D *latins* and *Cypr* have *εκβαλ. και ονειδ.*

In other words the shortened form of text in B proves upon examination to rest upon an insecure foundation, for the "make-up" of it includes a number of passages [see under "Solecisms of B"] where B not only stands alone, but which *W-H* do not consider to represent the "neutral" text, whereas in the examples given above (for argument's sake) the adhesion of B might have lent colour to the Hortian theory.

Or if, for instance, B omitted in *Luke* vi. 48 *τεθεμελιωτο γαρ επι την πετραν* as 604 *syr sin*, for observe that in this same chapter:

vi. 26. — *οι πατερες αυτων* is omitted by B 604 only with *sah syr sin*.

So that what is possibly basic here may well be also exhibited by 604 *syr sin* only at vi. 48.

The whole of chapter vi. deserves fresh study.

Observe vi. 31. — *και υμεις* B 604 Paris<sup>97</sup> *a ff l vg<sup>f</sup> Iren*<sup>int</sup>

34. — *εστι* B 604 *e aeth*

In ix. 20 observe — *με λεγετε ειναι* 604 *Dial (aeth)* but not B.

Similarly at i. 21 — *εν τω ναω* by 604 with the important cursives 108 142 *al<sup>3</sup> Sod*<sup>1098</sup> might with propriety be observed in B for the "shorter text" if really an exceptionally "neutral" text. Here *syr sin* is wanting. For at this place we note the usual change of order, a barometric pressure, indicative of addition to a basic shorter text:

*εν τω χρονιζειν εν τω ναω αυτον* BLWΞΥ 2<sup>pc</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> *sol*

" " " αυτον εν τω ναω Ν *rell (praeter min<sup>8</sup> om. εν τω ναω)*

and *a b d* do not express *αυτον*.

---

† *Tertullian's* Latin (against *Iren*<sup>int</sup>), "*novum additamentum inicit veteri vestimento*" agrees with *Epiphanius'* Greek, which neither *Tischendorf* nor *Soden* have noticed.



Similarly, as regards other cursives. Observe

- Luke**  
 i. 44. —εν αγαλλιασει by 33 but not B  
 xii. 12. —εν αυτη τη ωρα by 33 and *Origen* but not B  
 xviii. 34. το ρημα (—τουτο) D *fam* 1 25 157 291 *it*<sup>pl</sup> coupled with *syr cu* and *sin*, *sah* 1/7 and *boh*<sup>pl</sup> and *arm*, but not B.

- John**  
 viii. 52. τις τον εμον λογον 33 *Origen soli*, but not B.

If B omitted της Συριας at *Luke* ii. 2 as does *syr hier* we might think it basic. Or if B omitted της Ιουδαιας in *Luke* i. 5 as do *Evan* 255 [neglected by *Soden*] and *diatess* we might talk of neutrality for B. Or at *Luke* iii. 1 where *ℵ* omits της ιουδαιας after ποντιου πιλατου as does *Dial*.

- Luke**  
 vi. 27, 28, 29, 30 (*cf.* also verse 31). Had B shown us either *Justin's* or *Clement's* forms of these verses we might think B were neutral, but B does not offer us their text.

45. *Dial* [*negl. Sod*] omits with *ff* [*negl. Tisch*] της καρδιας after εκ του αγαθου θησαυρου. Not so B. [At ix. 2 where *Dial* omits τους ασθενεις with B *Hort* follows.]

46. τι με λεγετε D 28 *Clem*<sup>quater</sup> et d *Iren*<sup>int</sup> bis *Orig*<sup>int</sup> dicitis, while B and most have τι δε με καλειτε. (K 259 *z*<sup>scr</sup> λαλειτε.)

Very noticeable hereabouts in chapter vi. and chapter vii. are omissions of *ℵ* not shared by B. Among these note:

- vii. 20. —οι ανδρες *ℵ*, whereas B and most have προς αυτον οι ανδρες, while D 33 a d r *sah* (*aeth syr hier*) have οι ανδρες προς αυτον, the varying order suggesting that *ℵ*'s base may be original. *Cf. syr sin syr pesh.*

25. διαγοντες (*pro υπαρχοντες*) of *Clem* DKII *al.* finds no echo in B. 27 *fin.* —εμπροσθεν σου D 122\* [*negl. Sod*] a d l r *Tert*<sup>marc</sup> (*non liquet Epiph*<sup>marc</sup>) but B and the rest have it.

38. εβρεξε (*pro ηρξατο βρεχειν*) *Epiph*<sup>marc</sup> bis [*negl. Sod*] and D [*male Sod*<sup>133</sup> de 604] *it*<sup>pl</sup> *syr cu sin* but not B.

39. Had *Hort* found η απτομενη for ητις απτεται here he would surely have thought it "neutral," for so writes *Origen*, confirmed by D<sup>scr</sup>.

- viii. 3. Had B and any cursives read εταιραι for ετεραι here, as does the codex Alexandrinus repeated by *Sod*<sup>750</sup>, we might even have had this forced into the new printed text as "neutral."

24. τη θαλασση pro τω κλυδωνι του υδατος *Epiph*<sup>marc</sup> bis, while D omits του υδατος. Not so B. (*Sod*<sup>1260 1364</sup> add και τη θαλασση before τω κλυδωνι.)

27. D a d *y*<sup>scr</sup> H<sup>scr</sup> *vg*<sup>T</sup> (*copt*) *diatess* omit τις [*Sod* neglects all but D and a], but while most write ανηρ τις, B has τις ανηρ, as if τις had been supplied from the margin of the archetype and placed in a doubtful position (*cf. copt*).

Luke

- ix. 19. λεγουσιν οι μαθηται (*pro* οι δε αποκριθεντες ειπον) *Dial simpliciter et cf. syr sah contra B rell.*
22. Had B used σταυρωθηναι (*for* αποκτανθηναι) here as do *Justin Theodot* and *Dial* we might have thought this "neutral."
30. —οιτινες ησαν *Epiph<sup>marc</sup> bis* (*non liquet accurate Tert*) and *syr cu sin*, not B, while D a d *Arnob* have ην δε as most Latins, showing something fundamentally different in the original base.
31. —οι οφθεντες *Epiph<sup>marc</sup> bis.*
41. —και διεστραμμενη *Epiph<sup>marc</sup> bis Tert<sup>marc</sup>* and a [*negl. Sod*] e, but not B.
- [Here *Epiph* and *Tert* agree, while below *Tert* has *quousque ero apud vos* (—και ανεξομαι υμων), while *Epiph bis* has *εως ποτε ανεξομαι υμων* (—εως ποτε εσομαι προς υμας).] *Syr cu sin* reverse the order from απιστος και διεστραμ. to διεστραμ. και απιστος, as another barometric indication, while *diatess-arab* quoting from *Matthew xvii. 17* holds the *Matthaean* and *Lucan* order απιστος και διεστραμ. *Syr cu* in *Matt* reverses the usual order there to διεστραμ. και απιστος as *syr cu sin* in *Luke*.
- x. 5. —πρωτον *Tert<sup>marc</sup> Orig<sup>int</sup> et Const cum Paris<sup>97</sup> d r et D<sup>87</sup> 2* (*cf. D<sup>87</sup> 3 πρωτον ante οικιαν*). Non B.
16. *Cf. Ignat Hipp Cypr* against B and the rest.
19. Is there anything neutral about δεδωκα by *NBC\*LX al. pauc it<sup>pl</sup> Orig etc.*, against the express διδωμι of *Justin Iren<sup>int</sup> Eus* confirmed by D c d *syr cu sin* [against *Aphraat Ephr*] *syr pesh diatess* and the rest of the Greeks? *Soden* actually suppresses the witness of *Justin*.
24. —και βασιλεις *Tert<sup>marc</sup>* confirmed by D d and a *effil Method.* Not B.
- xi. 13. οντες *Dial* and *Epiph<sup>marc</sup> bis Cyr<sup>luc</sup> Ath* with *N DKMXII* and several notable cursives including 157 and 213 (= *Sod<sup>129</sup>*), against B *etc. υπαρχοντες.*
38. *Cf. Tert<sup>marc</sup>* [which *Soden* neglects] and D 130 251 *latt syr cu sin* against B and the rest.
- xii. 2. ου φανερωθησεται (*pro* ου αποκαλυφθησεται B *rell*) D (et d a non revelabitur) *Tert<sup>marc</sup>* non patefiet.
5. βαλειν (*pro* εμβαλειν) DW *Epiph<sup>marc</sup> bis Clem<sup>Theodot</sup> contra B rell* εμβαλειν. (Is not *Soden* wrong in quoting *Justin* for βαλειν?)
8. —των αγγελων *N\* 259 Epiph<sup>marc</sup> Tert<sup>marc</sup>.*
11. φερωσιν *Clem Origen Cyr<sup>hier</sup>* confirmed by D b q against εισφερωσιν *NBLX al. pauc.* and προσφερωσιν A *rell*. May I ask why εισφερωσιν should be "neutral" rather than φερωσιν?

Luke

This is followed in D<sup>NR</sup> (*latt*) and *Clem* by *εις τας συναγωγας* for *επι τας συναγ.* Cf. *Tisch ad loc.*

*ibid.* — *η τι prim.* *Clem Orig Cyr<sup>hier</sup>* confirmed by D 157 *latt syr aeth* (cf. *copf*).

xii. 14. *κριτην tantum* — *η μεριστην Tert<sup>marc</sup>* confirmed by D *d c* 28 33 *syr cu sin*, while the others vary as to their amplification of *κριτην*, 157 going so far as to substitute *αρχοντα και δικαστην* for *δικαστην η μεριστην* or *κριτην η μεριστην*. And *sah* 1/6 has *μεριστην* without *κριτην* or *δικαστην*, while *aeth* reverses the order (always a suspicious sign) giving “divider and judge.” Surely *Marcion* and D look more “neutral” than B.

19. — *αναπανου* 36 [*negl Sod*] and *Clem<sup>bis</sup>* cat ox (*ff, sed aliter ff*) against the rest.

20. *τινος (pro τινη)* *Tert<sup>marc</sup>* confirmed by *d* and *latt* (*cujus*) *Iren<sup>int</sup> Cyr*, and in Greek by D *Clem* 1/3 *Antioch*, but as the Latin lends itself to this, although *cui* is possible, and *Clem* has *τινος* once and *τινη* twice this passage cannot be emphasised.

21. D *a b d* omit the verse and *Clem* does not quote.

27. *πως ουτε νηθει ουτε υφαινει Clem* confirmed by D *a d syr cu sin Tisch<sup>txt</sup> Sod<sup>txt</sup>* against *πως αυξανε ου κοπια ουδε νηθει* of *NB* and most and *W-H txt*.

30. *ζητει Tert<sup>marc</sup> Clem*, confirmed by D (*d Tert quaerunt*), against *επιζητει* of A *unc<sup>pl</sup> Bas Ath*, and *επιζητουσι* of *NBLTX fam* 13 33 *Paris<sup>97</sup> ff l r* and *f Tert<sup>orat</sup>*. If we seek a neutral, *ζητει* appears the more probable.

32. *ο πατηρ (-υμων) Epiph<sup>marc</sup> bis.* *N* has *υμων ο πατηρ* as *sah boh*.

*B* *rell ο πατηρ υμων*.

38. *και εαν ελθη τη εσπερτινη φυλακη* D (*fam* 1) *b c e d. ff i l* confirmed by *Epiph<sup>marc</sup>* and *Iren<sup>int</sup>*, as against *και εαν ελθη εν τη δευτερα φυλ. και εν τη τριτη φυλ.* of most, or *καν εν τη δευτερα και εν τη τριτη φυλ.* of *NBLTX* 33 131 *Cyr<sup>unc</sup> sah etc.* Had B exhibited *Marcion's* and D's version Hort should surely have acclaimed it “neutral,” whereas there are two separate recensions apparently outside of *Marcion* and D *latt*. *Clem* does not quote.

46. Order: *και το μερος αυτου θησει μετα των απιστων Dial* *Caes* supported by D *d r<sub>2</sub> gat vg<sup>E</sup> sah boh syr*, against *και το μερος αυτου μετα των απιστων θησει* of B and most. This is not an uninteresting place, for while the Latins go with B<sup>or</sup> here in *Luke*, it is to be observed that in *Matthew* xxiv. 51 although *θησει* follows *υποκριτων* there in Greek, D and most Latins place *ponet* before *meta* as *Dial* in *Luke*. That *Dial* and *Caes* are from *Luke* is proved by their holding *απιστων* against

Luke

υποκριτων of *Matthew* which only *X* *fam* 1 and a few cursives substitute in *Luke*, while the *diatess* conflates.

- xii. 48. απαιτησουσιν *Justin Epiph Clem Const Mac Bas*<sup>quinques</sup> *Antioch* [*Soden* only mentions *Basil*] confirmed by *DU* *al*<sup>30</sup>, against αιτησουσιν of the rest. See under "Improvement" at xii. 20 further as to αιτουσιν and απαιτουσιν.

Besides if we wish to enquire what text was actually in use in *Antioch* in the middle of the fourth century, it would not, as regards the Acts at any rate, seem to have been that of *NB* or of what has been called the Antiochian or Constantinopolitan recension, but that of *D*! For *Eustathius* quoting Acts xvi. 16/19 has in verse 19 a text approximating *D* in quite an exceptional manner [*Sod* neglects *Eustath*]:

*Eustath*: θεασαμενοι ουν οι κυριοι της θεραπαινιδος ως εκποδων ωχετο της εργασιας αυτων η ελπις.

*D*: ως δε ειδαν (= *sy*) οι κυριοι της παιδισκης οτι απεστερησθαι της εργασιας αυτων ης ειχαν δι αυτης.

ordinary text: ιδοντες δε † οι κυριοι αυτης οτι εξηλθεν η ελπις της εργασιας αυτων.

The full quotation is subjoined.

Act

xvi. 16/19. (ἐγένετο δὲ παιδίσκην) ἀπαντῆσαι τινί (φησιν) ἔχουσιν πνεῦμα πύθωνος ἥπερ ἐργασίαν πολλὴν παρέχειτοῖς κυρίοις αὐτῆς μαντευομένη. 17 τοιγαροῦν αὕτη κατακολουθήσασα τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ ἡμῖν ἔκραζε λέγουσα οὕτως Οὗτοι οἱ ἄνθρωποι δοῦλοι τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου εἰσὶ οἷτινες καταγγέλλουσιν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν σωτηρίας. 18 καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ πολλὰς ἔπραττεν ἡμέρας... παραγγέλλω σοι (λέγων) ἐν ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐξελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῆς (εἶτα τὸ πρᾶγμα διηγούμενος ὁ συγγραφεὺς ἐπιφέρει) καὶ ἐξῆλθεν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ. 19 θεασάμενοι οὖν οἱ κυριοὶ τῆς θεραπαινίδος ὡς ἐκποδὼν ὥχετο τῆς ἐργασίας αὐτῶν ἡ ἐλπίς ἐπιλαβόμενοι τὸν Παῦλον καὶ τὸν Σίλαν εἵλκυσαν εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας... †

† καὶ ιδοντες *B*. ιδοντες (—*copula*) *A d*.

‡ 16. πύθωνος *C<sup>3</sup>D<sup>2</sup>EHLPS Cyr Did Lucif e gig* πύθωνα *NBABC<sup>3</sup>D<sup>2</sup>* 83 81 *vg Orig*.

ἀπαντῆσαι *ADHLP<sup>5</sup>* ὑπαντῆσαι *NBCE min<sup>8</sup> Orig*.

ἥπερ (πρὸ ἧτις) *new*  
παρεχεί *Galland* (al. παρεσχεν) *Eustath*. *C* παρειχετο, tell omni  
παρειχεν

17 *in it*. + τοιγαροῦν *new*, prob. addition of *Eustath* as he narrates freely.  
κατακολουθήσασα, *ACEHLP* κατακολουθήσασα; κατακολουθούσα *NBD* 180; παρακολ. *alig*.

+ οὕτως (post λέγουσα) *new*? No others apparently. Only *copt* + *XC*  
ἡμιν (πρὸ ἡμιν) *AC<sup>3</sup>HLP al. e sah*? *copt aeth Orig Lucif*? *Chr*; *υμιν*  
*NBDE<sup>5</sup> C<sup>3</sup> vg syz arm aeth*

## REGARDING OUR "JUNIOR" DOCUMENTS.

I would like to make an observation here.

It is of no use thinking we can hope to prosper in these studies by changing and re-changing the numbers and symbols attaching to our critical authorities. It only discourages the student, and leads to endless confusion and inaccuracy. Symbols do not change the value of MSS or of groups. The time spent upon re-cataloguing and in deciphering and reducing to order the new catalogues were better spent upon such studies as *Rendel Harris'* monographs on D *d* and Δ *δ*, or *Adalbert Merx'* three-volume digest of *syr sin*.

Before many more years have passed I expect to see much greater attention paid to certain features of the testimony of our important cursive documents. These have been put aside because junior in years to certain MSS written in uncial characters. I do not mean that attention will be given to the testimony of certain cursives as entities, but to certain features of their testimony which have probably preserved the truth against the mass. No one has ever listed these places. I submit tentatively a list of a few of these places involving omission or substitution or turn of phrase which seem to me to be of very great interest. The list can be added to by other students and so made to grow from a mustard seed into a tree the shadow of whose critical branches may spread beyond our dreams to-day and help elucidate many matters in connection with the early text. The point is that when one of these cursives joins B, if only alone, it has been considered as strengthening B, but when alone with the oldest versions such a cursive has been utterly disregarded.

(Cont<sup>d</sup> from last page).

18. και τουτο (pro τουτο δε) Orig *syr* not Gr Latt copt. om. δε sah and H<sup>g</sup> gig

επραττεν (pro εποιε) new

+ λεγων replaces ειπεν belonging before in the clause.

19. θεασαμενοι ουν (pro ιδοντες δε) new. No authority,

As to clause following compare only D *d* with *Eustath*:

{ D ως δε ειδαν (= *syr*) οι κυριοι της παιδουκης οτι απεστερησθαι της εργασιας  
αυτων ης ειχαν δι αυτης  
*d* cum vidissent domini ejus puellas quoniam ispes et reditus eorum quem  
habebant per ipsam  
*Eustath* θεασαμενοι ουν οι κυριοι της θεραπαινιδος ως εκποδων ωχετο της εργασιας  
αυτων η ελπις

*Gigas* is blissfully ignorant of this recension but with *Lucifer* uses *reditus* for *quaestus* of all others, except *e operationis*.

*Possible "neutral" base to be observed in some cursives  
as against N or B.*

[In the following passages I have used the Textus receptus in giving the context, which seemed simpler than any other way to exhibit a base with which the variations can be compared.]

The examples are nearly all of necessity omissions from the narrative as we have it. This does not commit me to the "shorter" text theory in its fullest sense.]

Matt. vi. 16.

Of fasting:

αφανιζουσι γαρ τα προσωπα αυτων οπως φανωσι τοις ανθρωποις νηστευοντες.

N\* 244 with *g*<sub>1</sub> *k* *syr* *pesh* and *pers* have the singular το προσωπον.

Matt. xvii. 20.

Concerning the wording of the command of faith for the removal  
of the mountain:

Ο δε Ιησους ειπεν αυτοις · Δια την απιστιαν υμων · αμην γαρ λεγω υμιν εαν εχητε πιστιν ως κοκκον σιναπεως ερειτε τω ορει τουτω · Μεταβηθι εντευθεν εκει, και μεταβησεται · και ουδεν αδυνατησει υμιν.

εκει is omitted by 33 892 Soden<sup>351</sup> lat<sup>1</sup> φ<sup>1</sup> 3382 *g*<sub>2</sub> *l* *vgg*<sup>fero omi</sup> Hier<sup>Exec</sup> and *syr* *aeth*.

*Syr sin* and *pers* omit both εντευθεν and εκει.

Matt. xvii. 25.

Of tribute:

Και οτε εισηλθεν εις την οικιαν προεφθασεν αυτον ο Ιησους λεγων · τι σοι δοκει Σιμων; οι βασιλεις της γης απο τινων λαμβανουσι τελη η κηνσον; απο των υιων αυτων η απο των αλλοτριων;

Here 604 with Δ 28 [negl. Soden] and *Evst* 47 [negl. Sod. *passim*] omit αυτων.

Tischendorf only records Δ. Soden only records Δ 604.

*Evst* 47 here is an exceedingly important witness. Neither Tisch. nor Sod. quote Origen, but Matthaei has occasion to quote him, for his ms 238 (not mentioned by Soden) reads απο των ιδιων αυτων and Origen remarks: απο των ιδιων υιων η απο των αλλοτριων αυτων; and again on verse 26 he repeats: ουκ απο των ιδιων υιων αλλ απο των αλλοτριων αυτων.

This emphasis on his part lends colour to the absence of αυτων in the real base since he has to repeat and emphasise ιδιων.

Matt. xviii. 25.

Of the debtor:

Μη εχοντας δε αυτον αποδουναι εκελευσεν αυτον ο κυριος αυτου πραθηναι, και την γυναικα . . .

Here 604 omits *o κυριος αυτου* outright with *fam* 1 the Latin *g*<sub>1</sub> and *syr cu sin*, both being extant here, and most of Chrysostom's codices, while *MBDL* and some Latins retaining *o κυριος* omit the *αυτου*. Tischendorf says "*Or*<sup>libere</sup> *o βασιλευς*," but is this correct? Does it not perhaps signify that in *Origen's* copies *o κυριος αυτου* was absent and *o βασιλευς* supplied by him, as *o κυριος* or *o κυριος αυτου* by others?

Matt. xx. 12. Of the labourers :

λεγοντες (οτι) ουτοι οι εσχατοι μιαν ωραν εποιησαν, και ισους ημιν αυτους εποιησας, τοις βαστασας το βαρος της ημερας και τον καυσωνα.

Here 604 (with 220, an important ms, and 242\*) omits *της ημερας*. No others apparently, yet there are subtle variations which point to something amiss, *syr cu* saying "the weight of the whole day and the heat," *syr sin*: "the weight of the day in the heat," *Thos*: "that have borne the weight of the whole day at noon."

Why supply *ολης*? If *της ημερας* was absent in the base it would account for some supplying *της ημερας* and some *ολης της ημερας*.

Besides, 251 (another important cursive) writes *το βαρος και τον καυσωνα της ημερας* as does *aeth*, suspiciously adding *της ημερας* in another order, as does *Origen* once; while *pers* with *syr pesh* has: *το βαρος της ημερας και τον καυσωνα αυτης*.

Matt. xxi. 27. Of Christ's answer to the chief priests :

Και αποκριθεντες τω Ιησου ειπον ουκ οιδαμεν · Εφη αυτοις και αυτος ουδε εγω λεγω υμιν εν ποια εξουσια ταυτα ποιω.

Here 604, with another important cursive 243 and the latin ms *l*, omits *και αυτος*, while *c ff*<sub>2</sub> substitute *και ιησους*, and *℣ e ff*<sub>1</sub> *h syr cu pesh* and *pers ιησους*. *Augustine* substitutes *Dominus*, and in another place *et Dominus*.

Matt. xxv. 11. Of the virgins :

Τοτερον δε ερχονται και αι λοιπαι παρθενοι λεγουσαι . . . Here 604 alone leaves out *παρθενοι*.

You may ransack *syr aeth copt* and the rest of the *Greeks* with the *Latins* and not find the omission agreed to. Yet the *persian* version omits !

This is really very striking and bears upon my contention that the base of *pers* although *Græco-Syriac* antedates *syr cu* and *syr sin*.

A reference to *D d* will show an extra long line here, *λεγουσαι* and *dicentes* being squeezed in. Possibly *παρθενοι* absent very early was already just supplied before the *D d* parent was executed.

Matt. xxvi. 33.

Concerning Peter's confession of attachment to our Lord :

Αποκριθεις δε ο Πιτρος ειπεν αυτω · "Ει και παντες σκανδαλισθονται εν σοι, εγω ουδεποτε σκανδαλισθησομαι."

*Tischendorf* does not admit us into the inner sanctum of textual criticism here, for the important little word *αὐτῷ* is omitted by (a) *b c ff<sub>2</sub> μ* [hiant *e k*] *vgg*<sup>2P Reg I A xviii</sup> *Chryostom* and *Hilary*, and the omission is confirmed by *sah*<sup>111</sup> *syr sin* with its faithful ally *pers* and 604 with *f<sup>scr</sup>* (in *Advers. Crit.* = 503 *Scrivener* or 517 *Gregory*).

*Tischendorf* had no Greek witnesses at the time, for although 503 had been collated by *Scrivener* in 1863 it was not published until after *Scrivener's* death. *Soden* adds his large *fam<sup>4a</sup>* in which is included 503 [see this family again in the combination at Matthew xvii. 20 above].

*Horner* only quotes *sah*<sup>111</sup> and *syr sin* for omission, neglecting Greek Latin and Persian witness.

The point is whether *Peter* announced this to those assembled round our Lord or to our Lord directly, and there is a vast difference between a quiet asseveration and a noisy and popularity-bidding public address to the crowd generally. There was sufficient authority without the Greeks for *Tischendorf* to mention the omission. *Merz* cannot have noticed the large support for *syr sin* for he does not dwell upon the point at all.

Matt. xxvi. 49/50.

Of Judas' betrayal:

Και ευθως προσελθων τῷ Ἰησὺ εἶπε Χαιρε ραββι καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτον. Ο δε Ἰησους εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἐταίρε ἐφ' ὧ παρεί;

Here 604, with the rather important cursive *e<sup>scr</sup>* and *Soden*<sup>1094</sup> (a *ms* at Sinai), omits *αὐτῷ* as does *syr hier*.

D says Εἶπεν δε αὐτῷ ο ἰησ ἐφ' ο παρεί ετεραι and

*d* dixit autem illi ihs ad quod venisti amice (another mixture of ellipsis and suspension for *amice*, noticed elsewhere as to D's greek, for which that document is famous). *ℵ* and *z<sup>scr</sup>* omit Ἰησους [this is quite neglected by *Soden*] writing "ο δε εἶπεν αὐτῷ."

Matt. xxvi. 71. Of the damsel's identification of Peter:

Ἐξελθοντα δε αὐτον εἰς τὸν πυλῶνα εἶδεν αὐτον ἀλλῃ, καὶ λέγει τοῖς ἐκεῖ Καὶ οὗτος ἦν μετὰ Ἰησου τοῦ Ναζωραίου.

157 writes καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ἐκεῖνη.

Now *syr sin* and *pers* OMIT *ἐκεῖ* here and thus agree with 157.

The rest have *αὐτοῖς* or *τοῖς* but with *ἐκεῖ*.

Here is a pretty puzzle. How did 157 get *ἐκεῖνη* if *ἐκεῖ* did not stand in its exemplar (otherwise close to *syr* and *pers*)? But if *ἐκεῖνη* were basic and *αὐτοῖς* became mutilated and read as *τοῖς*, *τοῖς ἐκεῖνη* would become intolerable and therefore be changed to *τοῖς ἐκεῖ*.

Cf. *syr sin* ܐܠܗܐ ܕܢܝܨܐܢ (-*ἐκεῖ*) as against:

*syr pesh* (*ἐκεῖ*) ܐܠܗܐ ܕܢܝܨܐܢ.

*Herman von Soden* refers to *syr sin's* omission of *ἐκεῖ* in his upper notes but does not refer to 157 (he never cites *pers*) and *Tischendorf* cites



neither *pers* nor 157 although *Scholz* (p. 99 N.T.) had recorded 157 correctly and reported *pers*. (Cf. Part II. note on — *εκει* at John xviii. 2).

Then consider the + *και θελω* of 157 at Mark v. 23 with *pers* alone + *θελω* or + *peto*, and this reading will strike us as not very young after all.

Then, after this addition, consider the important omission by 157 alone at Mark xiv. 57 of *κατ αυτου λεγοντες* which may well be what *Merx* calls *Wanderwörter* and the *κατ αυτου* supplied by an over-zealous person in editio II of the sacred narrative. *Pers* omits *κατ αυτου*, writing “*quidam alii subornarunt testes falsos et dicebant*” instead of “*και τινες ἀναστάντες ἐψευδομαρτύρουν κατ’ αὐτοῦ λέγοντες.*” Now *k* also omits *κατ αυτου* writing “*et alii surgentes commentiebantur et dicebant . . .*” Whether *λεγοντες* is a “*Wanderwort*” or not remains an open question, but *κατ αυτου* would seem to be *wander-words*. Upon reference to the passage it will be seen that *κατ αυτου* is not necessary; would hardly have been excised if present, but readily supplied in an “improved” edition. Remains *syr sin*, which says “*Now some rose up against him and say,*” eliminating *ἐψευδομαρτυρουν*. This text looks to me younger here than *pers* and 157. There has been a change made in early times, and the methods employed should be able to teach us something. *D d c ff* insert *κατ αυτου* after *ελεγον* as an afterthought as it were (from the margin?). That good old witness *aeth* also omits *κατ αυτου* (against *sah boh*), but something bothered him for he duplicates the *λεγοντες* or conflates *λεγοντες* of most with the *ελεγον* of *D (syr sin)*, for he writes “*et surrexerunt testes falsi et loquuti sunt et dixerunt.*”

For — *κατ αυτου* we have now 157 *k pers aeth*.

Can you find that combination in *Tischendorf*? *Tisch* is silent. Or in *Soden*? *Soden* is blind to it, for he simply says “*Om κατ Η<sup>δ</sup> 371 (om κατ αυτου).*” I presume we should now add that very important document δ 371 (= *B* elsewhere) for — *κατ αυτου*.

*Pers* comes in again with 157 at Luke ix. 13 for the omission of *εις παντα* (before *τον λαον*) and *Paris*<sup>97</sup> witnesses to *παντα* being an addition or “*Wanderwort*” by omitting it and writing *εις τον λαον*. (Three *boh* codices confirm 157 *pers*).

NOTE.—Neither *Tischendorf*’s nor *von Soden*’s apparatus cover many curious things exhibited by individual Greek mss, although they have Version support. A critical edition, however, which neglects these things in our day is faulty and not up to date. It forces the student to hunt over the older authorities from *Mill* to *Scrivener*, which should not be necessary. The text-history can be rewritten in a measure from detailed observations of the kind indicated above.

Observe further, as regards the “shorter” text, that an omission such as that of *k* in Mark xv. 8 of both *ααβας* and *ααβουσας* points in a different direction to that of other omissions, for here *k* avoids a very difficult choice between the two words, and his omission does not indicate that the omission is basic.

Mark i. 35. Of Christ's withdrawal into a desert place for prayer:

Και πρωι εννυχον λιαν αναστας εξηλθε και απηλθεν εις ερημον τοπον κακει προσηυχετο.

The primitive text here is in doubt, but 226 with *Sod*<sup>1493</sup> *a* (exiit et abiit) *c* (exiens inde abiit) and *syr sin* omit *αναστας* while D does the same but opposite *εξηλθεν και απηλθεν* has "*exsurgens abiit.*" *Syr sin* has "came forth went" without copula, but *syr persh* "antevertit et surrexit ac abiit," while *pers* is "surrexit et in locum desertum abiit."

B<sup>sr</sup> and a few important cursives such as 28 213 2<sup>pe</sup> *Sod*<sup>551 1089</sup> have *αναστας εξηλθεν* without *και απηλθεν* [but 604 Paris<sup>97</sup> and most agree with *text recept*], while W has *αναστας απηλθεν* without *εξηλθεν και*.

*b e q* surgens abiit *d* (as above) *ff vg*<sup>g</sup> exsurgens abiit

*δ* surgens egressus et abiit

*f vgg* surgens egressus abiit *l* surgens egressus est et abiit

*Goth* holds the three expressions: *usstandands usiddja jah galaith ana. Sah* is wanting. *Boh*<sup>p1</sup> express "*Και αναστας πρωι εννυχον λιαν εξηλθεν,*" but some vary.

Mark ii. 26 *fin.*

Of Christ's reference to David's action in the House of God:

. . . και εδωκε και τοις συν αυτω ουσι.

604 and 2<sup>pe</sup> omit the final *ουσιν*. To these now add W *Sod*<sup>750</sup> and *Sod*<sup>444</sup> with *aeth*.

301 *Eust* 31 44 150 omit the whole clause, as does *pers*.

Observe that W *Sod*<sup>750</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> and 604 invert: *και εδωκε και τοις μετ αυτον* (—*ουσι ους ουκ εξεστιν φαγειν ει μη τοις ιερευσιν* (*πρω ους ουκ εξεστι . . . τοις συν αυτω ουσι*) so that the *ους* here might have caused the loss of *ουσι*, but not so *aeth*, which maintains the other order, yet loses *ουσι* at the end.

Mark iv. 1. Of the crowd at the lake-side-teaching:

Και παλιν ηρξατο διδασκειν παρα την θαλασσαν · και συνηχθη προς αυτον οχλος πολυς ωστε αυτον εμβαντα εις το πλοιον καθησθαι εν τη θαλασση · και πας ο οχλος προς την θαλασσαν επι της γης ην.

Here 604 alone leaves out *προς την θαλασσαν* altogether, but is supported by *aeth*.

D reads *περαν της θαλασσης* as *a d q* and the Syriac, omitting *επι της γης*, and W *εν τω αιγιαλω* as the Latins *b c e f ff g r*, while the versions vary, *pers sah* and most *boh* expressing *εν τω αιγιαλω της θαλασσης*. The other *boh* codices vary, and *arm* expands to "on the shore they were keeping to the dry land."

*fam* 1 read *παρα την θαλ. επι της γης ην* and

Δ reads *εις* „ „ „ „ „ *ησαν* (δ in vel circa mare super terra erat sic)

apparently *επι* „ „ *προς* „ „ *ην* (or *ησαν*)

Laura<sup>A 104</sup> changes the order of the end to *ην επι της γης*, and NBCLΔ *d* (erant sic) 892 with Evst 49 and *y<sup>scr</sup>* and a few substitute *ησαν* for *ην*, while some Latins as *syr* have *stabat* or *staret* (*c*) or *sedebat* (*e*). Some have *επι την γην ην*.

In the midst of all this confusion (with *d* going against D with Δ, and δ going against Δ with D) 604 stands out with a simple omission and has support of *aeth*.

Mark iv. 20. Of the parable of the sower:

Και ουτοι εισιν οι επι την γην την καλην σπαρευτες . . .

28 2<sup>pe</sup> and *pers* [*mut. syr cu sin*] omit *ουτοι*.

Add to these *Sod<sup>so</sup>* and deduct 157 which I find does not omit [confirmed to me again by Monsignor Mercati] although Scholz reports it for omission with 28.

Observe that NBCLΔ substitute *εκεινοι*.

Mark v. 23. Of Jairus' speech to our Lord:

Και παρακαλει αυτον πολλα λεγων οτι το θυγατριον μου εσχατως εχει ^ ινα ελθων επιθης αυτη τας χειρας οπως σωθη και ζησεται.

157 inserts *και θελω* before *ινα ελθων* = *pers* [*Obs.* the extraordinary base of *pers* in the later examples].

Mark v. 43. Of Christ's injunction for silence following the healing:

Και διεστείλατο αυτοις πολλα ινα μηδεις γνω τουτο και ειπε δοθηναι αυτη φαγειν.

Here 604 alone [now joined by *Sod<sup>so</sup>*, a very important witness], with *d* (which *Soden* neglects and he does not mention *c ff*) and *c ff q* with *aeth* and *pers* (replacing *syr cu* and *sin* which are wanting), omits *τουτο* altogether. The *diatessaron* quotes *ex Luc viii. 56*, which brings in *το γεγονος* (*ο δε παρηγγειλεν αυτοις μηδενι ειπειν το γεγονος*), and therefore *Sod<sup>so</sup>* 604 *aeth pers c d ff* and *q* are quite unaffected by a harmony here in Mark.

Gregory will please note this and bring it into his new apparatus, for Tischendorf neglects the omission altogether, not even recording *d* which has: *ut i nemini dicerent* although D has *ινα μηδεις γνωι τουτο*, the *τουτο* occupying a place on the line below, opposite which *d* has nothing.

—*τουτο* may well be basic, and have been supplied to round out the sentence.

As a matter of fact the Latins vary the expression, *l δ* and *vgg* having *id*, *e* having *illum*, *a f* having *hoc*, and *b* having *istut*, while *c d ff q* omit.

Mark vi. 39. Of the feeding of the multitudes:

Και επεταξεν αυτοις ανακλιναι παντας συμποσια συμποσια . . .

604 with *arm* and *pers* (this conjunction here apparently antedating the syriac of *syr sin*) omit *παντας*, while *Origen* with 2<sup>pe</sup> and *Soden<sup>so</sup>*

changes the order (barometric sign) to *παντας ανακλιναι*, and the important minuscule 33, with all *boh* mss but one, elides *παντας* and substitutes *αυτους*.

33 604 therefore with *boh arm* and *pers* form no mean combination here for omission.

[In my collation of Evan. 604 p. lxvi delete 473 (= 2<sup>pe</sup>) and place the reading of 604 on p. xxxii. under "Unique."]

Mark vii. 6. Of the quotation from Isaiah :

Ο δε αποκριθεις ειπεν αυτοις (οτι) καλως προεφητευσεν Ησαιας περι υμων των υποκριτων ως γεγραπται : . . .

For *ως γεγραπται* 604 substitutes *λεγων* with *c ff* *dicens*, *D d i και ειπεν*, *fam* 1 2<sup>pe</sup> *arm* *ως ειπεν*, *Sod*<sup>750</sup> *ος ειπεν* as *a b* : *qui dixit*, while *syr sin* conflates : "as it is written that he had said."

Clearly the reading of 604 *c ff* is the simplest of all, and *syr sin* knew both readings at the time that document was prepared.

Mark vii. 8. Of the ceremonials of the Pharisees :

Αφεντες γαρ την εντολην του Θεου, κρατειτε την παραδοσιν των ανθρωπων βαπτισμους ξεστων και ποτηριων και αλλα παρομοια τοιαυτα πολλα ποιειτε.

28 and 2<sup>pe</sup> (to which now add *Sod*<sup>750</sup>) omit *πολλα*.

Observe great variety among others : *τοιαυτα πολλα παρομοια*, *πολλα παρομοια τοιαυτα*, *παρομοια πολλα τοιαυτα*, *παρομοια τοιαυτα ποιειτε πολλα*, *παρομοια ποιειτε τοιαυτα πολλα*, always shifting *πολλα* about, while a few drop *τοιαυτα* in the process.

*Om. vers. syr sin. Cf. diatess. Explic. NBLWA ad verb. ανθρωπων.* (*Soden* neglects 28 for omission of *πολλα*.)

Mark vii. 23. Of the wickednesses of the human heart :

*παντα ταυτα τα πονηρα εσωθεν εκπορευεται και κοινοι τον ανθρωπον.*

This follows the long list of *evil things* in verse 22, and *τα πονηρα* is therefore not necessary in verse 23. For this reason it may have been removed as an "improvement" by 1 2<sup>pe</sup> and 604, who omit, but it is rather a strong combination among the cursives, and might be basic. I say "might" at a venture, but upon turning up the *persian* version, there again in that marvellous document, so pregnant of "base," *τα πονηρα* does not find a place. It is quite striking.

(Some omit *παντα*, some *ταυτα* and some *τα ante πονηρα*.)

Mark viii. 25 *fn.*

Concerning the wording of the final clause as to the blind man's restored sight :

. . . και ενεβλεψεν τηλαυγως απαντας.

Some read *απαντα* (and *DW παντα*), and some *δηλαυγως*, and some

*ανεβλεπεν*, and some vary the order in which *απαντας* or *απαντα* finds a place, and *aeth copt syr* have *παν* or *omne*, but it is left for 33 alone of Greeks with *c k* alone of Latins to omit *απαντα* or *omnia* outright! *Tregelles*, confirmed by *Soden* (I suppose by independent collation), mentions 33, but *Tischendorf* has not mentioned 33 in his VIIIth edition, confining himself to the enumeration of *c k*. In such a place as this *omnia* might well be an addition, and its omission be basic.

Mark x. 8. Of the close union of husband and wife:

*ωστε ουκετι εισι δυο αλλα μια σαρξ.*

28 (neglected by *Soden*) 71 *Eust* 222, now joined by W and *Sod*<sup>309</sup> with *d* [contra *D<sup>ac</sup>*] *ff k syrr (pers) sah aeth (boh<sup>am</sup>)* have *ουκ* for *ουκετι*.

Notwithstanding this large testimony, *Tischendorf* does not even mention this variation. In his day only 28 71 and *Eust* 222 witnessed to it. But now add W (confirming 28) and *Sod*<sup>309</sup> with *d ff k* and versions.

Mark x. 21. Of the righteous young man:

*Ο δε Ιησους εμβλεψας αυτω ηγαπησεν αυτον και ειπεν αυτω . . .*

*αυτω*, after *εμβλεψας*, is omitted by 28 and *Clem*. *Tischendorf* did not know of 28 when citing *Clem*. *Sod*<sup>1033 1337</sup> also omit.

Mark x. 47. Of blind Bartimaeus:

*Και ακουσας οτι Ιησους ο Ναζωραιος εστιν ηρξατο κραζειν και λεγειν . . .*

28 omits *και λεγειν* with *sah*<sup>130</sup> (*Horner* overlooks the agreement of Greek 28 with his *sah* ms).

Upon turning once more to the *persian* (oh wonderful and neglected monument of antiquity for control of such readings) it is found that *pers* also omits the *και λεγειν* or *λεγων* of the rest. *Pers* as interpreted reads: *et clamore sublato vociferatus est* without any mere "saying" about it.

Mark x. 51.

*Και αποκριθεις λεγει αυτω ο Ιησους τι θελεις ποιησω σοι; Ο δε τυφλος ειπεν αυτω ραββوني ινα αναβλεψω.*

28 with 892 (omitted by *Soden*) omits this second *αυτω*. They are supported by *c aeth* and once more by that wonderful *pers* (against the syriacs which we know): "Caecus respondit."

Mark xii. 4. Of the parable of the lord of the vineyard:

*Και παλιν απεστειλε προς αυτους αλλον δουλων.*

This *και init.* is omitted by 28 and *c e sah 4/6 arm*, and turning to *pers* the omission is once more confirmed by that version [*syr sin* omits the whole verse].

On the other hand *παλιν* is omitted by W (sister of 28) with X and *one sah* MS<sup>73</sup>, not all as would be gathered not only from *Tisch* but from

*Soden*, for the rest substitute "Afterwards" except *sah*<sup>120</sup> which has both **ܐܬܝܢܥܘܥ** and **ܐܢ**.

Observe that *arm pers* quite replace the old syriac here, which omits the verse.

(Note.—The viciousness of the elder *Soden*'s practice of quoting "af" instead of *e* or *k* or *e k* is illustrated excellently here. He says "om *και*<sup>1</sup> *I*<sup>a 168</sup> af *c*." He means "om. 28 *e c*" for *k* has it "Et iterum.")

Since *W* reads *Και* and 28 *Παλιν* for *Και παλιν* thus opposing the text of the majority, but each in a different way, it is clear that a mark of deletion stood in the margin of the common parent and was applied by one of them to the wrong word.

Mark xii. 26. Of the resurrection, referring to Exod. iii. 6:

Περι δε των νεκρων οτι εγειρονται ουκ ανεγνωτε εν τη βιβλω Μωσεως επι της βατου ως ειπεν αυτω ο Θεος λεγων εγω ο Θεος Αβρααμ . . .

*λεγων* is omitted by 28 *b aur vg<sup>f</sup> diatess-arab sah* 1/4 and *syrr* with *pers* and *arm*.

Mark xii. 30. Of the first and second Commandments:

αυτη πρωτη εντολη · και δευτερα ομοια αυτη . . .

There is very great variation here, but 28 2<sup>pe</sup>, joined by *W Sod*<sup>750</sup> *k Eus*<sup>mcoll</sup> † simply omit *εντολη* while having *αυτη πρώτη* which is omitted together with *εντολη* by **NBELΔΨ** *copt*. The syriacs retain *αυτη πρωτη εντολη*.

Mark xii. 34. Of the silence imposed by Christ's answer:

Και ουδεις ουκετι ετολμα αυτον ^ επερωτησαι.

Here 28 with *pers* once more adds *τι* after *αυτον* and before *επερωτησαι*. So do *b q* at the end: *Et nemo iam audebat eum interrogare QUICQUAM*. This wording (without *quicquam*) is exactly that of *d* which retains *jani*, while the Greek of *D* opposite lacks *ουκετι* as do *Ψ* 124 *Sod*<sup>1454</sup> and *sah boh*. *b-q* especially in conjunction are very important in Mark. How did *τι* get in or out of the text? The secret seems to lie in the *ουκ/ετι*, for instance 61 *c<sup>cr</sup>* reading *ουκ* without *ετι* but not supplying *τι* later. *x<sup>cr</sup>* places *ουκετι* last, writing: *και ουδεις ετολμα αυτον επερωτησαι ουκετι*. A few and *a* merely reverse *ουκετι ετολμα* to *ετολμα ουκετι*, **N Paris**<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>711q</sup> *c* merely reverse *αυτον επερωτησαι* to *επερωτησαι αυτον*. It remains for *W* to supply a key, for *W* writes: *και ουδεις ετολμα αυτον ουκετι επερωταν*, bringing *ουκετι* before *επερωταν*, which in a close uncial supplies the missing *τι* exhibited by *b* and *q* and 28 *pers*. The closest relationship between *W* 28 and some common parent is thus shown again here, for 28 also writes *επερωταν* instead of *επερωτησαι*. (*Evan* 433 *boh* supply *ετι* after *επερωτησαι*, omitting *ουκετι* previously.)

† *Diserte* "κατὰ Μάρκον" . . . totum locum exscripsit et in fine ita: αυτη πρωτη · και δευτερα ομοια ταυτη (*sic*).

Mark xiii. 2. Of the great buildings of the Temple

*Και ο Ιησους αποκριθεις ειπεν αυτω βλεπεις ταυτας τας μεγαλας οικοδομας;*

*ο Ιησους* is not found in 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 *a b i r?* and *vg*<sup>KV</sup>. Add also W and *Soa*<sup>750</sup> which are observed also to omit.

There exists quite some variety as to the form of the sentence, and there is hardly any reason to remove *ο Ιησους*, while there is every reason to insert it, because the Greeks do not mention Jesus by name in verse 1.

Horner neglects 2<sup>pe</sup> and 604 while giving *a b i*.

Mark xiv. 35. Of the agony in the garden:

*Και προελθων μικρον επεσεν επι της γης και προσηυχето. . .* So most, but DGΣ *Soa*<sup>750</sup> *fam* 1 *fam* 13 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 *al*<sup>20</sup> *latt arm syr sin* add *επι προσωπον* or *επι προσωπον αυτου*, retaining *επι της γης*.

28 alone substitutes *επι προσωπον αυτου* for *επι της γης* with *c*: in *faciem* (—*ejus*), for *k syr sin* and others have *in faciem super terram*.

*Pers* opposes 28 here and has merely *in terram* as most Greeks.

The conflation is old. 28 must have chosen the wrong half of it, unless by some chance 28 and *c* alone retain the right half.

Mark xiv. 46. Of the capture of Christ:

*Οι δε επεβαλον επ αυτον τας χειρας αυτων και εκρατησαν αυτον.*

892 (and now add W *Soa*<sup>750</sup> also) *d ff aeth pers* omit *επ αυτον*. This amid a great variety of readings by the others.

Mark xiv. 57. Of the trial of Christ:

*Και τινες ανασταντες εψευδομαρτυρουν κατ αυτον λεγοντες οτι. . .*

157 (and now *Soa*<sup>871</sup> a very important witness) with *k pers* and *aeth* omit *κατ αυτον*.

Observe the manner of treating this in some others. See p. 438.

Mark xv. 36.

In connection with him who tendered the sponge of vinegar:

*Δραμων δε εις και γεμισας σπογγον οξους περιθεις τε καλαμω εποτιζεν αυτον λεγων Αφετε ιδωμεν ει ερχεται Ηλιω καθελειν αυτον.*

This is a difficult place. As W is lacking here (*hiat* xv. 13–38) and 28 exhibits a rare reading I will cite it.

28 alone substitutes for *λεγων* “*οι δε λοιποι ελεγον*” which may come from a reference to *Matt* xxvii. 49 “*οι δε λοιποι ελεγον*” [*B* and a few there *ειπον*]. In *St. John* xix. 29 *περιθεντες* (and *πλησαντες* previously of some MSS) makes the action that of more than one man.

The fact remains, although the *diatess* follows *Matthew's* wording “But the rest said,” yet using all the Gospel accounts (§ lii.) that *syr sin* and *pesh* turn *λεγων* into the plural supplying a copula, while *pers* merely has a stop after *εποτιζεν αυτον*. and continues “*dicebant.*” They therefore

read the plural without supplying *λοιποι* of Matthew. D<sup>sr</sup> cuts the knot by omitting *λεγων* altogether. *Fam* 13 substitute *λεγοντες* for *λεγων*, but do it in an ampler way, turning all into the plural. Is *λεγων* of most really basic in Mark or an error, and did the original read *λεγουσι*? Or was the original Latin *dicunt* or *dicebant* and not *dicens*?

Luke i. 21. Of Zacharias' delay in the Temple:

Και ην ο λαος προσδοκων τον Ζαχαριαν και εθανμαζον εν τω χρονιζειν αυτον εν τω ναω.

εν τω ναω is omitted by 604 and *Soden*<sup>1098</sup>, as well as by 34 39 108 142\* and k<sup>scr</sup> (these *Soden* neglects).

*Syr cu* and *sin* are both missing.

BLWΨΞ and 2<sup>o</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> change the order.

Luke i. 29. Concerning Mary's wonder at the salutation of the angel:

Η δε ιδουσα διεταραχθη επι τω λογω αυτου, και διελογιζετο ποταπος ειη ο ασπασμος ουτος.

Here the famous cursive c<sup>cr</sup> omits *ειη* with I<sup>a</sup> *Sod*<sup>1054</sup> 3017 *fam* η exc. b 346 t. *Syr cu sin* are wanting.

L and a few substitute *ει*. D *Sod*<sup>760</sup> *Sod*<sup>178</sup> emphasise *αν ειη*, but — *ειη* might well be basic.

(Observe *e* "recogitans quia sic benedixit eam.")

Luke i. 66.

Of the wonder engendered at the baptism of John Baptist:

Και εθεντο παντες οι ακουσαντες εν τη καρδια αυτων, λεγοντες. . .

Here 604 omits *οι ακουσαντες* with *e syr pesh*<sup>36</sup>, while *syr sin* omits *παντες* and *οι ακουσαντες*. *Soden* now adds 348 (his<sup>121</sup>, quite an important MS) for omission of *οι ακουσαντες*, while neglecting to record 604.

For *οι ακουσαντες* CD<sup>sr</sup> 118–209 130\* 234 892 *al. et Sod*<sup>337</sup> 1354 (*cf. ff goth arm*) substitute *οι ακουοντες*, while *pers* (as rendered) = *Et quicunque audivit*, and *aeth* (as rendered) = *Et custodierunt in cordibus suis omnia quae audiverant*, showing an apparent basic difference to be compromised. (See p. 454 Mark vi. 2).

Luke ii. 3. Of the enrolment or registration:

Και επορευοντο παντες απογραφεισθαι, εκαστος εις την ιδιαν πολιν.

Here c<sup>scr</sup> omits *εκαστος*. *Tischendorf* fails to report this and *Soden* refuses to give the omission a place in his apparatus, but it is important. Observe that *Burkitt* for *syr sin* has to supply "each one" in italics [he uses very few italics thus]: "Now every one (𐤀𐤍𐤏𐤃𐤁𐤁) [was going] to be [enrolled] even from [his] city was each one going to his place that there he might be enrolled."

Notice also that *ℵ* omits *παντες* with *Sod*<sup>761</sup> 1225. *ℵ*\* writes *και*



επορευοντο (retaining the plural verb) *εκαστος απογραφεσθε εις την εαυτων πολιν*, shortening, as *pers* and *diatess*: "*Et unusquisque ivit ut in urbe sua describeretur*," and *syr<sup>pesh</sup>* "*Et ibat quisque ut describeretur in urbem suam*."

There is something to ponder over here.

Luke ii. 11. Of the angel's speech to the shepherds:

οτι ετεχθη υμιν σημερον σωτηρ, ος εστι Χριστος Κυριος.

*σημερον* is omitted by 604 with 18 50 55 62 116 201 n<sup>scr</sup> *Eust* 52. *Soden* adds <sup>s 208</sup> but neglects 604 and all the rest. (What is the use of such notes?)

The important witness *Sod*<sup>s 371</sup> of the NB family changes the order to *σωτηρ σημερον* (as *boh<sup>k</sup>*) and may have imported *σημερον* from his margin.

Luke vi. 10. Concerning the man with the withered hand:

Και περιβλεψαμενος παντας αυτους, ειπε τω ανθρωπω · Εκτεινον την χειρα σου · ο δε εποιησεν ουτω · και αποκατεσταθη η χειρ αυτου υγιης ως η αλλη.

This passage is practically in the same class as the one noticed toward the end of this chapter at vi. 48 *fin*.

Instead of ο δε εποιησεν, NDX *al. it vg copt syr pesh arm aeth* substitute ο δε εξετεινεν (compare Matt. xii. 13, Mark iii. 5), and a minority have ο δε εποιησεν ουτως. The detail will be found in *Tischendorf*, but he neglects to state that c<sup>scr</sup> omits the phrase altogether! *Soden* having found another MS (*Sod*<sup>1443</sup>) which omits, *does* mention this in his notes.

*Syr sin* is missing here, and therefore we have no check on the critical codices c<sup>scr</sup> *Sod*<sup>1443</sup>. Yet the situation is suspicious and reminds us of vi. 48. There, we have two alternatives: *δια το καλως οικοδομησθαι* having no reference to the parallel, and *τεθεμελιωτο γαρ επι την πετραν* as in Matt. vii. 25, while *syr sin* and *gr.* 604 show us a blank. Here we have ο δε εποιησεν (ουτω) having no reference to the parallel, and ο δε εξετεινεν a plain verbal importation from the double parallels in Matt. and Mark, while c<sup>scr</sup> and *Sod*<sup>1443</sup> exhibit a blank in Luke.

The matter should be carefully noted, for the supplementary matter interjected in alternative phrases is not at all necessary at this place.

Luke vi. 48 *fin*.

Of the parable of the house whose foundations are secure:

"τεθεμελιωτο γαρ επι την πετραν" of most,  
or "δια το καλως οικοδομησθαι αυτην" of the few [*negl.*  
*αυτην Ti<sup>notul.</sup>*],

but entirely omitted by 604 and *syr sin* [*Pers* has the upper clause with most].

*Aeth* already conflates both readings.

Luke vii. 9. Of Christ's appreciation of the centurion's faith :

Ακουσας δε ταυτα ο Ιησους θαυμασεν αυτον · και στραφεις τω ακολουθουντι αυτω οχλω ειπε . . .

604 alone of Greeks, to which now add *Sod*<sup>351 1493</sup>, omits ταυτα.

With this *syr sin* and *syr hier* agree, as also *aeth* and one *boh* *ms*<sup>K</sup>, while one *sah* *ms*<sup>85</sup> says ΕΤΔΕ ΝΑΙ "concerning these things." Horner omits to chronicle *syr hier* (all three codices) which agree with *syr sin*.

Observe that while *syr pesh* has ταυτα it changes the order, and *C<sup>gr</sup>* has Ακουσας δε ο Ιησους ταυτα.

Luke ix. 9.

Concerning Herod's speech about John Baptist (see Matt. xiv. 2 and Mark vi. 14) :

ειπεν δε Ηρωδης · Ιωαννην εγω απεκεφαλισα · τις δε εστιν ουτος περι ου ακουω τοιαυτα ; και εξητει ιδειν αυτον.

For *τις δε εστιν ουτος* *Evan* 248 substitutes *τις εστιν ουτος* alone, dropping δε, but with *c e* : "quis est hic," and : "hic quis est" by *b ff<sub>2</sub> l q r* (cf. 243 > *τις δε ουτος εστι*). With the Latins without copula go *syr cu sin pers* and *diatess* (and *sah* 1/5 *boh*<sup>duo</sup>).

The *diatess* interlards Luke ix. 9 between Matt xiv. 12<sup>b</sup> and xiv. 13<sup>a</sup>, but is clearly from Luke, avoiding Matt xiv. 2 here. See *diatess* § xviii. 20 and its beginning.

Alone, with *aeth*, *Evan* 157 substitutes *ουν* for δε in Luke ix. 9.

Luke ix. 13. Of the loaves and fishes and the multitudes :

Ειπε δε προς αυτους · Δοτε αυτοις υμεις φαγειν. Οι δε ειπον · Ουκ ειναι ημιν πλειον η πεντε αρτοι και δυο ιχθυες, ει μητι πορευθεντες ημεις αγορασωμεν εις παντα τον λαον τουτον βρωματα.

157 (with Paris<sup>97</sup> *εις τον λαον tantum*) and *pers* with *boh*<sup>tribus</sup> omit *εις παντα*.

Luke ix. 20. Of Christ's enquiry for the testimony of the apostles :

Ειπε δε αυτοις · υμεις δε τινα με λεγετε ειναι ;

604 omits *με λεγετε ειναι* altogether, alone with *Dial*. As to *syr sin* it is mutilated, but Burkitt says "there is not space for all the words."

*Pers*, observe, slightly alters, saying "Vos de me quid dicitis."

Some *aeth* mss I believe omit *με ειναι*.

Luke x. 5. Of the salutation due on entering a house :

Εις ην δ' αν οικιαν εισερχησθε πρωτον λεγετε · Ειρηνη τω οικω τουτω.

Paris<sup>97</sup> and D<sup>2</sup> with *d\* r* *Orig* and *Tert*<sup>marc</sup> omit *πρωτον*. (*Tert*<sup>marc</sup> : "quam introissent domum pacem ei dicere.")

Luke xii. 34. Concerning the proverb of the heart and its treasure :

οπου γαρ εστιν ο θησαυρος υμων, εκει και η καρδια υμων εσται.

*c<sup>gr</sup>* omits *εσται* outright with *Sod*<sup>1260</sup>.

Of the Greeks LA substitute *εστιν*.

D and some place it between *εκει* and *και*.

The word may not originally have completed the sentence at all, which is complete without the second verb. *Tischendorf*, as so often, does not report *c<sup>scr</sup>* here.

The reason for which I emphasise the witness of *c<sup>scr</sup>* even when alone is that elsewhere this MS lends its voice to very powerful minority groups, as at xix. 23 — *και init.* Of course *c<sup>scr</sup>* is quite a critical codex as may be seen in its graphic *εξελθειν* for *ελθειν* at Luke xiv. 20 *fin.* or at Luke xxiv. 32 *fin.*

(*Cf.* *c<sup>scr</sup>* at Luke xiii. 30 *οι εσχατοι προ εισιν εσχατοι.* Paris<sup>97</sup> supplies *οι* but has *εισιν* which *c<sup>scr</sup>* lacks.)

Luke xiii. 15.

Of our Lord's personal application in his answer to the *ἀρχισυναγώγῳ* as to healing on the sabbath:

Ἀπεκρίθη οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος, καὶ εἶπεν, Ἵποκριτά, ἐκαστος ὑμῶν τῷ σαββάτῳ οὐ λυεῖ τὸν βουν αὐτοῦ ἢ τὸν οὐν ἀπο τῆς φατνῆς καὶ ἀπαγαγὼν ποτίζει; ταύτην δέ, θυγατέρα Ἀβραὰμ οὐσαν . . .

The authorities cannot agree whether our Lord said *ὑποκριτά!* or *ὑποκριταί!* and are very much divided. As the record says *ἀπεκρίθη οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος καὶ εἶπεν* (and not *ἀπεκρ. οὖν ὁ Κύριος καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ*) it may well be that the less personal *ὑποκριταί* and not *ὑποκριτά* was the apostrophe.

But *c<sup>scr</sup>* alone shows us a blank here, and has neither.

*Tisch* again fails to exhibit here the omission of *c<sup>scr</sup>*. *Sabatier* calls attention to *Tertullian*<sup>Maro</sup> which (although *non liquet*) has no introduction and begins "*Unusquisque vestrum sabbatis non solvit*" . . . quoting in full to *ποτίζει*. Certainly *c<sup>scr</sup>* and *Tert* should be coupled and mentioned together.

Luke xiv. 8/9. Of the place at the wedding feast:

Μηποτε ἐντιμότερος σου ἢ κεκλημένος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ σε καὶ αὐτὸν καλεσας, εἰ σοι ἂν Δὸς τοῦτω ἅ τοπον . . .

Here 157, with *copt* and *syr*, supplies *τον* before *τοπον*. This may have been lost immensely early. Observe *aeth*: "*Cede huic personae*" ("the place" understood).

Luke xvi. 12.

What Christ said in his comment on the parable of the unjust steward:

Καὶ εἰ ἐν τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγενεσθε, τὸ ὑμετερον τίς ὑμῖν δώσει;

157 and *e i l* with *Tert*<sup>Maro</sup> are definite as to the substitution of *εμον* for *ὑμετερον*.

(*ὑμετερον* by BL *Sod*<sup>551</sup> and *Eust* 21 *Orig.*)

Luke xvii. 23. What action to take when the Son of Man is announced :

*Και ερουσιν υμιν · Ιδου ωδε η ιδου εκει, μη απελθητε μηδε διωξητε.*

157 with *syr* and *pers* omits *μηδε διωξητε*. (Cf. B and *sah*.)

Luke xviii. 2.

Of a judge in a certain city and the importunate widow :

*λεγων · Κριτης τις ην εν τινι πολει . . .*

c<sup>scr</sup> and o<sup>scr</sup> with *pers*<sup>vid</sup> omit *τις* ; but then *syr sin* thereagainst omits *τινι*, perhaps for the same purpose of destroying the pleonastic "pair" : "A certain judge there was in a certain city." But note that the important ms Paris<sup>97</sup> also omits *τις* with c<sup>scr</sup>.

(Some have *τη* for *τινι*, and 33 has *εν τινι τη πολει*.)

*Sah* very simply "A judge in a city" with two indefinite articles : *οκριτης η οπολις*, and *boh* also, which does not however transliterate the Greek words.

Luke xviii. 9.

Of the introductory clause as to the parable of the publican and the pharisee in prayer :

*Ειπε δε και προς τινας τους πεποιθотας εφ εαυτοις οτι εισι δικαιοι και εξουθενουντας τους λοιπους · την παραβολην ταυτην · Ανθρωποι δυο ανεβησαν εις το ιερον προσευξασθαι . . .*

c<sup>scr</sup> leaves out *την παραβολην ταυτην*. So does D<sup>scr</sup> and *d*. No others apparently. But observe that the *syriacs sah* and *pers* bring it in quite early in a peculiar place and order before *προς τινας*, "And he was saying this similitude (or parable) against (certain) folk that trust in themselves . . .," while the Latins, even those which have *similitudinem* for *parabolam*, keep the Greek order.

*Tischendorf* should certainly have mentioned c<sup>scr</sup>. He only says : "D om."

Luke xxii. 15.

Concerning the last supper and the mention of the Passover :

*Και ειπεν προς αυτους · επιθυμια επιθυμησα τουτο το πασχα φαγειν μεθ υμων προ του με παθειν.*

In this very important passage (uncomplicated by the accounts in Matthew and Mark) the noteworthy cursive 71 with *vg*<sup>p</sup> and *syr cu sin boh*<sup>M</sup> with *Tert*<sup>blarc</sup> very definitely : *Concupiscentia concupivi Pascha edere vobiscum antequam patiar*, completely suppress *τουτο* or *hoc*, against the other Greeks and Latins, against *syr pesh* and the *diatess* (quoting Luke xxii. 14/16 continuously). The only Latins besides *vg*<sup>p</sup> to throw light on the matter are *c* and *Hilary*. In *c* "hoc" is present but "Pascha" absent; thus also in *Hil*<sup>in Psa.</sup> 63 : *desiderio cupivi hoc manducare*, but *Hil*<sup>in Psa.</sup> 130 neglects *hoc* and introduces *Pascha* without *hoc* : "desiderio

*desideravit cum discipulis Pascha manducare.*" Possibly in c's copy a mark was present for the deletion of *hoc* which that ms applied to *Pascha*. *Tischendorf* and *Soden* completely ignore the omission of *τουτο*, and again refuse to let us enter with them the *arcanum* of textual criticism.

Luke xxiii. 15.

Concerning Pilate's speech to the assembled multitude about our Lord's apparent guiltlessness :

... ανεπεμψα γαρ υμας προς αυτον [αλ. ανεπεμψεν γαρ αυτον προς ημας] και ιδου ουδεν αξιον θανατου εστι πεπραγμενον αυτω.

Here *ιδου* is omitted by e<sup>cr</sup> [I wonder if this should not be c<sup>cr</sup>] and D<sup>sr</sup> d with *vgg*<sup>pr</sup> [*hiat r*<sub>1</sub>] *syr cu sin pers* and *diatess*.

*Tisch* and *Soden* report this because D d also omit. I introduce it to show the omission upheld by one cursive. The *diatess* quotes continuously Luke xxiii. 4/16. There is an *ιδου* in the previous verse xxiii. 14 not modified by *syr cu sin pers*, but for *και ιδου εγω* there D writes: *καγω δε*, and d: *et ego autem*, and *diatess* also without *ecce* there.

Luke xxiv. 39.

Of Christ's request for identification after the resurrection :

Ιδετε τας χειρας μου και τους ποδας μου οτι αυτος εγω ειμι · ψηλαφησατε με και ιδετε · οτι πνευμα σαρκα και οστεα ουκ εχει καθως εμε θεωρειτε εχοντα.

The Greek cursive 300 omits *αυτος* with a *r*? *l*. *Syrr copt* omit *αυτος* altogether, while the rest vary the order and form of *αυτος εγω ειμι* considerably. (*Pers* omits altogether). *αυτος* probably came in for emphasis from the margin. *Soden* adds <sup>371</sup>, presumably <sup>371</sup> = 4 (Paris nat. 84) for plain omission of *αυτος*, and indeed an addition to the basic text would be quite likely here.

(*Soden*, as usual, neglects the witness previously reported for omission, viz. *Evan.* 300.)

John i. 15.

Concerning the wording of John Baptist's witness to Jesus :

Ιωαννης μαρτυρει περι αυτου, και κεκραγε λεγων · Ουτος ην ον ειπον · Ο οπισω μου ερχομενος, εμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν.

314 (= *Sod*<sup>C13</sup>) reads *εστι* for *ην*. The Latins vary between *est* (*a b c e f q r μ aur vgg*<sup>8</sup>) as (*syr*), and *erat* (*h δ [hiat d] vgg*<sup>r31</sup> *Iren Aug*), but *Eust* 54 omits outright.

This is interesting because *ℵ* alone of Greeks omits *ον ειπον* following, with *arab*, as if between *ην* and *ον ειπον* a mark had perhaps been set indicating omission, and *ℵ* had omitted *ον ειπον* and not *ην*.

The *bohairic* really seems to omit *ην* (ΧΕ ΦΑΙ ΦΗ ΕΤΑΙΧΟQ ΕΘΒΗΤQ).

John ii. 19. Of the rebuilding of the temple (of His body):

*Απεκριθη ο Ιησους και ειπεν αυτοις Λυσατε τον ναον τουτον και εν τρισιν ημεραις εγερω αυτον.*

*Eust* 47 reads with *Ignatius* *δια τριων ημερων*.

John v. 27. Of the Father's great gifts to the Son:

... *Και εξουσιαν εδωκεν αυτω και κρισιν ποιειν* ...

Now *εδωκεν* is omitted outright only by *Eust* 47 and *diatess*, making *εδωκεν* of verse 26 serve here also. Observe that the *syriac* and *pers* substitute *fecit* for *dedit* in verse 27. Neither *Tisch* nor *Soden* notice these readings.

John vi. 22. Concerning the departure of the disciples:

*Τη επαυριον ο οχλος ο εστηκες περαν της θαλασσης ιδων οτι πλοιαριον αλλο ουκ ην εκει ει μη εν εκεινο εις ο ενεβησαν οι μαθηται αυτου, και οτι ου συνεισηλθε τοις μαθηταις αυτου ο Ιησους εις το πλοιαριον, αλλα μονοι οι μαθηται αυτου απηλθον.*

Neglecting other variations, observe that the *syriacs*† with *pers* omit the last clause, as do the *diatessaron* and *Evan* 220 and *Eust* 222 (*z<sup>scr</sup>*). *Tischendorf* mentions 220 but neglects *z<sup>scr</sup>*, while *Soden* calmly ignores both Greek manuscripts.

There is no break in *diatess* between verses 22 and 23 (proceeding with 23/60 continuously). Observe that the Latins (so intimately connected with the *sy* and *diatess*) apparently do not recognise this omission.

(*℣* 56-58-61 *ff*<sub>2</sub> *l* omit *απηλθον* in this clause.)

John vi. 23.

Of the ships from Tiberias, whether they came, had come, or were there:

*Αλλα δε ηλθε πλοιαρια εκ Τιβεριαδος εγγυς του τοπου οπου εφαγου τον αρτον ευχαριστησαντος του Κυριου.*

892 and *Sod*<sup>1444</sup> with the *diatess* have *ην* for *ηλθε*.

Some have *ηλθον* for *ηλθε* placing it in various differing positions.

*℣* has *επελθοντων ουν των πλοιων* for *αλλα δε ηλθε* (or *ηλθον*) *πλοιαρια* and *ουσης* instead of *του τοπου*. *D* has *αλλων πλοιαριων ελθοντων* (*d aliae naviculae venerunt*). Cf. *b r*: et cum supervenissent aliae naves, cf. *sy cu*.

The *vg* has: *aliae vero supervenerunt naves*. (*Supervenerunt* is favoured by the Latins, but not by *a d e f*.)

Among all this variation, 892 *Sod*<sup>1444</sup> *diatess* substitute *ην*. It seems to me that, including this *ην*, it all savours of retranslation.

† *Syr sin* is said to be illegible here, but *sy cu* agrees with *syr pesh* and *pers* to omit. (*Pers* doubtless replaces *sy sin*.)

John vi. 42.

Of the murmuring Jews' speech concerning the parentage of our Lord and of his strange speech about his descent from Heaven :

Και ελεγον ουχ ουτος εστιν Ιησους ο υιος Ιωσηφ, ου ημεις οίδαμεν τον πατερα και την μητερα; πως ουν λεγει ουτος οτι εκ του ουρανου καταβεβηκα;

There is found to be a difference of opinion as to whether *ουν* or *νυν* should follow *πως*.

BCTW *Sod*<sup>760</sup> *boh arm syr hier Ath*<sup>codd</sup> supply *νυν*.

Σ and D on the other hand, with the other Greeks, most Latins and *sah* 4/7, prefer *ουν*.

The *peshitta* does neither, but prefixes *και*.

The editors are strangely enough agreed here; *Tisch* and *Hort* on the strength of BCT, and *Soden* on the strength of BCT and the additional W *Sod*<sup>760</sup>, print *πως νυν*. But are they right? Does not perhaps little *v<sup>scr</sup>* here hold the key, which cursive MS writes *πως tantum*?

The point is that *syr cu sin* and *pers* with *arab* and the *latins a e* and *sah* 3/7 are agreed to omit in the same way as *v<sup>scr</sup>*, merely saying *πως*. Still the editors might be right; but when we find PARIS<sup>97</sup> backing up *v<sup>scr</sup>*, the *syriacs*, *a e*, the *persian*, the *arabic*, and *sah* 3/7 for omission we must pause to ask the reason why.

Since therefore once more Σ and B are not agreed (and *aeth boh*<sup>quinqu</sup> *vg<sup>DR</sup>* conflate) does not Paris<sup>97</sup> hold (with *v<sup>scr</sup>*) the true base behind ΣB, and are not *syr pers* with *sah* 3/7 and Paris<sup>97</sup> *v<sup>scr</sup>* the purveyors of the "true text"?

John vi. 64. Of Christ's speech to the disciples on a certain occasion :

Αλλ εισιν εξ υμων τινες οι ου πιστευουσιν.

Here *τινες* is omitted by 157 alone, and indeed may well be an addition. *Tischendorf*, recognising this, chronicles the omission, but *Soden* does not think it worth while, although a reference to *syr sin* and *aeth* appears to confirm it. Observe here that the order of most: *εξ υμων τινες* (so also *syr cu*) is varied by STX<sup>b1</sup> and some very important cursives (plus *syr pesh hier*) to *τινες εξ υμων*.

John vi. 70. The apostrophe as to a traitor being among the twelve :

Απεκριθη αυτοις ο Ιησους · Ουκ εγω υμας τους δωδεκα εξελεξαμην και εξ υμων εις διαβολος εστιν.

*Evan* 28 omits *τους δωδεκα*. Cf. *syr cu sin*.

Note that 185 (*Sod*<sup>410</sup> and a very critical codex) omits *εξελεξαμην*, having evidently mistaken the word to be deleted. Thus again 185 alone omits *εξ* before *υμων*, intending probably to omit *εις* with Σ<sup>a</sup>; and thus 2<sup>o</sup> omits *και εξ υμων*, retaining *εις*.

John xiii. 14/15.

Of Christ's example in the washing of the feet :

Ει ουν εγω ενιψα υμων τους ποδας, ο κυριος και ο διδασκαλος, και

υμεις οφειλετε αλληλων νιπτειν τους ποδας. Υποδειγμα γαρ εδωκα υμιν, ινα καθως εγω εποιησα υμιν, και υμεις ποιητε.

Now this γαρ is omitted by 604 and the very important cursive c<sup>scr</sup>. The saying is more stately thus. Not "For I have given you an example," but very simply and majestically: "I (your Lord and Master) have given you an example."

Does *syr sin* omit? No, it has δε. Do any others? Apparently none except the *diatess*, for *Soden* says "om γαρ Ta I<sup>a</sup> 133/1386." Now the *diatess* is a good witness here, for it quotes continuously John xiii. 1/20. There are no other witnesses then for this stately phrase? Yes there are, and important ones too. *Soden's* notes in such cases are too maddening for words, for when he supplements *Tischendorf* (as here, *Tisch* neglecting the omission of c<sup>scr</sup>) he cannot even get the matter right.

Observe then that *syr hier*<sup>BC</sup> also omit. Is that all? No, for *pers* (wonderful witness!) also omits [against *syr pesh* and *sin*]. Is that all? No, not yet, for *d*, that other extraordinary witness, also omits, against *D*<sup>st</sup> opposite. Such opposition between *d* and *D*<sup>st</sup> invariably means a great deal. I discover these omissions of *von Soden* by chance, but *Sabatier* had already called attention to the reading of *d*. Students cannot possibly see these things in *Tischendorf* or *Soden*. *Aeth*<sup>int</sup> renders "Quia exemplum dedi vobis" without γαρ which the Coptic versions hold. Is this quite all? No, because *Aphraates* opposes *syr sin* and also omits γαρ altogether. For omission then, instead of *Tatian* 604 and c<sup>scr</sup> as *Soden* tells us, we have: 604 c<sup>scr</sup> *d pers syr hier*<sup>BC</sup> *diatess Aphraates* and (*aeth*).

John xix. 40. Of the custom of the Jews at burial:

Ελαβον ουν το σωμα του Ιησου και εδησαν αυτο οθουσις μετα των αρωματων καθως εθος εστι τοις Ιουδαιοις ενταφιαζειν.

Paris<sup>97</sup>, with *sah boh* (*aeth*), omits εστι. *Sod*<sup>780</sup> (*ed. B & G*) *Sod*<sup>1454</sup> omit εθος.

Observe *NW Greg*<sup>Nys</sup> substitute ην for εστι. (>εστιν εθος X<sup>b</sup> 185 a c ff n q) cf. e.

John xxi. 15. Of the risen one's speech to Mary in the garden:

Λεγει αυτη ο Ιησους · Γυναι, τι κλαιεις ; τινα ζητεις ; Εκεινη δοκουσα οτι ο κηπουρος εστι λεγει αυτω Κυριε . . .

28, with *syr sin* and *dimma*, omits ο Ιησους.

So, among the Latins, observe :

John xxi. 13.

Of Christ's post-resurrection action at the lake-side :

Ερχεται (ουν ο) Ιησους και λαμβανει τον αρτον και διδωσιν αυτοις.

c with *syr sin* omits this *ερχεται*.

c reads merely: *Tunc Jesus accepit . . .*

*syr sin* merely: *Et accepit Jesus . . .*



Luke vi. 45.

ο αγαθος ανθρωπος εκ του αγαθου θησαυρου της καρδιας αυτου  
προφerei το αγαθον· και ο πονηρος ανθρωπος εκ του πονηρου θησαυρου της  
καρδιας αυτου προφerei το πονηρον.

Here *ff*<sub>2</sub> alone elides the first της καρδιας, writing: *Bonus homo de bono d'ensauro suo proferet bonum* . . . thus alone agreeing with *Dial*<sup>221</sup>.

Mark vi. 2.

και γενομενου σαββατου ηρξατο εν τη συναγωγη διδασκειν· και πολλοι  
ακουοντες εξεπλησσοντο, λεγοντες: ποθεν τουτω ταυτα; . . .

As against ακουοντες of textus receptus supported by *NA*BCW *unc*<sup>7</sup> *al*<sup>pl</sup> and *d ff g<sub>13</sub> i l q r δ vgg* with *audientes*, *D<sup>87</sup>FHLΔ<sup>87</sup>Π<sup>1</sup>* *Sod*<sup>250</sup> some *minn*, including some interesting manuscripts (and *a* with *cum audissent*), prefer ακουσαντες, but *b c e* have neither but exhibit a blank. It is eminently a place, as will be seen upon close inspection, where a word could naturally be added, and the fact that the authorities vary as to its form or tense shows that it *may* be an early addition. The Greek ms W would probably have omitted with *b c e* had it continued this recension beyond Chapter V. I mention the example particularly because W ceases to convey this type of text before the end of ch. V. [*Hiant syr*<sup>cu sin</sup>, *sed habent syr*<sup>pesh hie</sup> *pers et diatess*]. Cf. *Luc* i. 66, p. 445.

Lastly, consider *Matt.* iv. 1 — υπο του πνευματος 892 *P<sup>act</sup> soli*, where the order is changed by *NK* 157 *syr aeth*, suggesting something amiss; and *Mark* ii. 11 — σοι λεγω εγειρε by *Paris*<sup>97</sup> alone, while W 40 46 61 252 *y<sup>act</sup> Sod*<sup>1443</sup> *b c e* omit σοι λεγω, and *r<sub>2</sub>* sah 1/2 omit εγειρε, and *N* [not reported by *Tisch* or *Sod*] varies the order >εγειρε σοι λεγω [*Hiant syr*<sup>cu sin</sup>].

#### VON SODEN'S NEW TESTAMENT, issued July 1913.

The crowning volume of *von Soden's* labours, viz. the New Testament volume itself, reached me after nearly all of Part I. of this essay was set up. I have used it for Part II. although this necessitated resetting a considerable amount of type, but for Part I. I was afraid I would not be able to use his work except occasionally in *St. Luke* and *St. John*, but I have managed to work in most of the evidence throughout.

I shall attempt no thorough review of his system or of his work at this place. Occasional notes will be found where it is desirable to correct his apparatus or to supplement my own.

I said at the beginning of this essay that the readings of *Westcott* and *Hort*, that is those of the ms B, had been generally accepted in England and nearly as much so in Germany. I am told that in Germany this is not the case. Let us look at a passage in *von Soden's* new edition for information.

Upon the strength of B, *Westcott-Hort* have printed at *Matthew* xiii. 4 και ελθοντα τα πετεινα κατεφαγεν αυτα, instead of και ηλθεν (or ηλθον) τα πετεινα και κατεφαγεν αυτα. B had support only from f *Matthaei* H<sup>act</sup>

y<sup>cr</sup> (not mentioned by *Tisch*) and *fam* 13 but they add *του ουρανου* after *πετεινα*.

I was surprised to find *von Soden* follow suit for this reading of *ελθοντα τα πετεινα* (-και). His note on the evidence is not absolutely clear, but one is to infer that besides B, these other mss have been found to have the reading, viz. 050 (ms at Tiflis related to the D text, which latter here has the ordinary text) δ 30 (= J, otherwise more related to K, which does not have it) ε 1444 (Athos, Pantel. 101) ε 1413 (Athos, Pantocr. 34) ε 1333 (Athos, Pantocr. 60) ε 1216 (Berlin 55, *Greg* 659); I suppose a little iota must stand for family 13, but he does not mention the mss by name nor do we know definitely whether the whole group of twelve mss:

13-69-124-174-230-346-543-788-826-837-983-Serres  
Scr. 556

has the B reading.

*Scholz* and *Tisch* after *fam* 13 had said "*alii*," but *von Soden's* list does not bear this out, his witnesses being mss unknown to *Scholz* and *Tischendorf*. *Tischendorf* neglected to mention the other witnesses represented by "*al*." They seem to be confined to the Lectionary class and are f of *Matthaei* (*Eust* 49) H<sup>scr</sup> (*Eust* 150) y<sup>scr</sup> (*Eust* 259). It would have been better for *von Soden* to mention these additional witnesses, as his choice of reading needs defence. It presupposes, like *Hort's*, that *ηλθον τα πετεινα* grew out of a basic *ελθοντα πετεινα*, but then B has *ελθοντα τα πετεινα*, and how account for the suppression of *και seq.*? If B and the others read *ελθοντα πετεινα* there would be some force in thinking that the other readings had sprung from this, but does not *ελθοντα τα πετεινα* merely indicate misreading or revision.

Where are K<sup>L</sup> and D and W and Z? Opposed to B. Where does *Origen* stand? Opposed to B. [This *von Soden's* notes do not indicate, as he merely reports K (*Κοινη*) for the regular reading.] Where are 33 and 892? Opposed to B. And so are all the rest of the mss, and the versions. I mention this to show that B is still regarded too highly in Germany as a basic or neutral text, and *von Soden's* text probably perpetuates an error of B and of his small following.

There is no trace of this in any of the Latins, and *e k*, both extant here, support the usual Greek text against B.

-και is however found in *sah* and *boh* 1/2<sup>1</sup> after the coptic manner. "Came the birds (of Heaven), they ate them."

Is this the secret? The other versions do not omit *και*. Must we trace this matter also to coptic influence on B? Very possibly; and B's forerunner, not liking *ηλθον...κατεφαγον* without copula in Greek, although the coptic admits of it, changed the first Greek aorist to the participle.

I claim that the versions have been unduly magnified sometimes to support a Greek reading, but also, as in the present case, unduly relegated

to the background when their joint testimony is of considerable value. If von Soden had properly grouped his evidence, and instead of saying :

*K gegen H<sup>8a</sup> etc.*

he had said

*K, I<sup>exc 060</sup>, rell et latt syr verss et Patres gegen H<sup>8a</sup> etc.*

we would have seen the real evidence.

Had he intimated that *sah* and part of *boh* omitted the copula *kai*, while holding *ηλθον*, we should also have got a glimmer of the probable reason for the B reading, but he is silent on this point.

This is not intended to be unfriendly criticism of *von Soden*, but only meant to indicate the lines along which we must work for a true grasp of the problems involved before printing new texts. After going through *von Soden's* apparatus to supplement my own, I have however come to very serious and disparaging conclusions as to his work in general. His notes are exceedingly inaccurate, his text is not founded upon any consistent method of using evidence, and I regret to say that he has repeatedly *invented Scripture* in his text without manuscript or Patristic authority. The proof to this effect shall be submitted separately, but some of it will be found noticed in scattered places in these volumes.

### *As to the Κοινή.*

There remains one argument to be dealt with, and that concerns the possibility of someone saying that, after all, the variations in B are *few in number* and probably less than in most mss. That is hardly so. If the reader wants a tenth-century example of a ms true to the Church type let him examine Matthaei's k, a most beautiful and neat ms, one of our very early cursives, and in this ms will be found a true exponent of the Κοινή. Had Erasmus used this, no fault could have been found, and yet but little difference is to be found between k and the textus receptus, while B and his group differ *infinitely more among themselves* at a period much more remote.

The Κοινή probably preserves "the true text" at Luke xxiii. 8 :

*ην γαρ θελων εξ ικανου (-χρονου) ιδειν αυτον ...* or, as reported by Ψ [*teste Lake*] 241 *Eust* 48 49 54 63<sup>vid</sup> 72<sup>scr</sup> H<sup>scr</sup> : *ην γαρ εξ ικανου (-χρονου) θελων ιδειν αυτον ...*

This is a peculiar construction, but, being the more difficult or idiomatic without *χρονου*, is probably to be preferred.

*Soden* here abandons the chief uncials, which have *εξ ικανων χρονων*, and prints *εξ ικανου θελων* without giving any authority for the K (Κοινή) which he quotes, for the K has *>θελων εξ ικανου*.

It so happens however that not only Ψ [*teste Lake contra Soden*] agrees with *Soden's* text of *εξ ικανου θελων*, with six lectionaries, but

that 241 (*Matthaei's* k), the very MS under consideration above, does this also. I wonder if *Soden* has stumbled on the "true text" here as confirmed by 241. For notice that the genius of all the versions requires the expression of *χρονου*. Hence the versions very likely reflected on our earliest Greek mss as seen already so often elsewhere, and led to the addition of *χρονου*, or substitution of *ικανων χρονων*, while the maligned *textus receptus* may hold the base here, and *Soden* and 241 preserve the true order! It is more than curious, for *Soden* appears to do so quite innocently, and ignorantly of the true evidence as to the *Koinḗ*.

*Winer* has a brief reference to the passage on p. 459 (English edition, 1882), but *Moulton* in his translator's note 3, while saying "In Luke xxiii. 8 quoted above in the text, *ἐξ ικανων χρονων* is no doubt the true reading" goes quite beyond his province, and is merely bowing to the authority of the company of *NBD(L)T* etc., whereas there is no such certainty about "the true text" here, and the indications seem to me to point the other way, and *χρονου* more likely to have crept in than to have slipped out or to have been suppressed in an "Antioch" revision.

As this brings up again *Turner's ex parte obiter dictum* of the oldest mss against the later ones ("which issue will never have to be tried again") I make free to go into the case as to *ικανος* a little more fully than *Winer* or *Moulton* (*Blass* is silent), for it is a very pretty test passage indeed.

Now that we have seen that the "oldest" mss were affected already by the versions or by the Greek text underlying the versions (whichever way the critics prefer to have it put), we can the more readily see the bearing of the present case as to the untrustworthiness of the "oldest" Greek mss in just such a case, and realize perhaps that, although mutually supporting each other, *NBD(L)T* 157 c d sah + T<sup>1</sup> *Sod*<sup>750</sup> 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Laura*<sup>A 104</sup> are wrong, and that the *Koinḗ* and 241 are right at Luke xxiii. 8.

The justification for this view is to be found in the classical example at Acts xx. 11 where the writer (doubtless St. Luke) in telling of St. Paul's long preaching at Troas, after the revival of Eutychus, says:

"*αναβας δε και κλασας τον αρτον και γευσαμενος, ἐφ' ικανον τε ομιλησας ἀχρι αυγης ουτως ἐξηλθεν.*"

Here "until break of day" qualifies *ἐφ' ικανον* sufficiently to give it its true Lucan meaning.

This *ἐφ' ικανον* then at Acts xx. 11 (not noted by *Winer*) is the complement of *ἐξ ικανου* in Luke xxiii. 8.

Besides, if we look further, we find that *ικανος* is used by the writer of the third Gospel and of the Acts no less than 25 times, whereas it is found elsewhere only six times in St. Paul's Epistles and three times in St. Matthew and St. Mark.

That St. Luke used *ικανον* without *χρονου* in xxiii. 8 is probable, because he so thoroughly understood the technical value of the word in Greek. Thus at Acts xxii. 6 besides using *φως ικανον* of the "great" light (an 'enfolding' light, see Acts ix. 3) at St. Paul's conversion, at Acts xx. 37 *ικανος δε εγενετο κλαυθμος παντων* "But they all set up a great weeping," at Luke xxiii. 9 (in close proximity to the passage under review) *επηρωτα δε αυτον εν λογοις ικανοις* "But he questioned him in many words" (a sufficiency of words), we find in Acts xvii. 9 of the taking of bond or security from Jason :

*"και λαβοντες το ικανον," simply,*

which is the correct technical term (not referred to by *Winer* or *Blass*). Therefore when we read at :

Acts xii. 12 *ου ησαν ικανοι συνηθροισμενοι και προσευχομενοι*  
or „ xix. 19 *ικανοι δε . . . τας βιβλους κατεκαιον ενωπιον παντων*  
we understand that *many* were gathered together, and that *many* burned their magical books, and not only that *certain* did so.

So again at Luke xxii. 38, of the two swords before the betrayal, our Lord's comment is reported thus by St. Luke: "*ο δε ειπεν αυτοις ικανον εστιν.*" That is to say not only "they are sufficient" but "it is plenty." (*Cf.* 2 Cor. ii. 6 *ικανον τω τοιουτω η επιτιμια αυτη*). Returning to Luke xxiii. 8/9 observe that we meet with the use of *ικανος* alone in *both* verses to signify "much" or "many" :

xxiii. 8. *Ο δε Ηρωδης ιδων τον Ιησουν εχαρη λιαν · ην γαρ θελων εξ ικανου ιδειν αυτον . . .*

xxiii. 9. *επηρωτα δε αυτον εν λογοις ικανοις · αυτος δε ουδεν απεκρινατο αυτω.*

The genius of the versions then permits of the translation of *ικανοις* in verse 9 by "many," but requires in verse 8 the addition of "time" to *ικανου*. The versions then can only be used to trace the matter in a subsidiary sense.

To *εξ ικανου* HMX ‡ Π *minn<sup>alq</sup>* and W add *χρονου* as most *Latins*, the *Syriacs*, *Aeth* and *Boh*.

While *εξ ικανων χρονων* is substituted by *ΝΒΔΤΤ<sup>1</sup> Sod<sup>750</sup> 157 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup>* and *c d* of the *Latins* : "*a* (or *de*) *multis temporibus.*" Thus also the *armenian* apparently, and the *sahidic* *ⲉⲓⲧⲏ ⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲉⲓⲱ* (against *boh* *ⲓⲥⲭⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲁⲙⲓⲱ ⲛⲁⲭⲣⲟⲛⲟⲥ*). And *ΑΓΓΛ unc vell<sup>6</sup>* most Greek cursives have with the *textus receptus* *θελων εξ ικανου*, while *Soden's* text prints *εξ ικανου θελων*. He recognised then that *χρονου* or *χρονων* had probably come in from the outside, but in adopting this order I hardly think that he recognised that it is supported by Ψ [*teste Lake contra Soden*] and by 241 *Evst* 48 49 54 63<sup>vid</sup> and z<sup>scr</sup> H<sup>cr</sup>.

I have not mentioned L. That MS, while having *εξ ικανων χρονων*, drops the *θελων*, which is necessary here, and affords a slight clue that

‡ X has the order : *εξ ικανου χρονου θελων*.

there may have been a mark set in text or margin for redeletion of *χρονων* which mark was misunderstood. Some difficulty also confronted the Latin MS *a*, for it omits altogether, having only: *erat enim cupiens videre illum*. That the four great cursives 157 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup> go with *ΝΒΔ(Λ)ΤΤ' Sod*<sup>750</sup>, and that 'T' supports 'T', and *Sod*<sup>750</sup> supports D, with the adhesion of the *sahidic*, shows that this is a fixed reading early. Yet it is absolutely circumscribed as to cursives by the consent only of the four named as far as I know.

The rest of the documents evidently lacked *χρονου* or *χρονων*, for of the uncials which add *χρονου*, viz. HMXIIW, most have strong *Latin* affiliations, certainly X and W, and the forty or fifty cursives which add are a *mixed* lot and some add only in the margin.

It is therefore an equally fixed tradition outside of these—that is to say with the remaining eleven uncials headed by A and with the great majority of cursives—that *χρονου* was *not* in the original text.

It is just here that Ψ [*teste Lake*] and that remarkable exponent of the *Koinḗ*, viz. 241 (*Matthaei's* beautiful tenth-century cursive k), with six lectionaries as named above, give Soden's order of *εξ ικανου θελων* (without *χρονου*).

The *textus receptus* then positively denies *χρονου* a place. This, according to *Tischendorf*, *Hort* and *Moulton etc.*, simply shows that the *textus receptus* was "revised." But was it?

Have we not clearly indicated by the undesigned coincidences cited from elsewhere in Luke and Acts that *ικανου* without *χρονου* would be eminently Lucan, that the revisers of Antioch (if there were any) would not be any more "classical" than Luke himself, but that more probably Alexandria (to prevent any ambiguity) not merely added *χρονου*, but changed *εξ ικανου* to *εξ ικανων χρονων*, and that this was done at so early a date as to mislead *Moulton* and other followers of *Tischendorf* and *Hort* into thinking that it is "the true text." It would certainly have been passing strange for "Antioch" to change the plural *εξ ικανων χρονων* to the singular *εξ ικανου* without *χρονου*.

At the end of our journey we can now afford to call attention to such a passage. No matter whether a consensus of *ΝΒ(Λ)ΤΤ'D Sod*<sup>750</sup> 157 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup> (*Sod*<sup>371?</sup>) read one way, their reading is improbable as an original one. *Merz* is silent on this passage, but *Soden*, notwithstanding additional testimony of 'T' *Sod*<sup>750</sup> 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup> (*Sod*<sup>371?</sup>), all unknown to *Tischendorf* and *Hort*, is content to oppose *ΝΒ(Λ)DT* 157 and these added authorities, and not only content to oppose them, but, unconsciously apparently, gives us the reading and order of 241:—

*ην γαρ εξ ικανου θελων ιδειν αυτον...*

and vindicates the *Koinḗ* as reported by its best representative (as I claim it to be) the MS 241. This MS it will be observed gives the order of *ΝΒΤ* without the addition.

The reading of 241 and the *Kovē* needs no defence, whereas the "Egyptian" reading has to be explained. I stand once more on the "harder" or "simpler" reading which I believe to be Lucan.

[In my review of *Soden* in J.T.S. April 1914 I have criticised *Soden*, not for adopting the reading of 241, but for failing to see that he had done so.]

#### MERX, RAMSAY, AND SODEN.

*Adalbert Merx*, daring but thoroughly competent scholar,† has arrived at the same conclusions that I have through an entirely independent channel of thought. His '*Die vier kanonischen Evangelien*' (3 vols.) should be read by everybody who professes to understand these studies. This is a thorough digest of the Sinaitic Syriac with its bearing on a foundation text. His conclusions, expressed in no uncertain terms, are that *ℵ* and B are thoroughly unreliable witnesses as exponents of a neutral and pre-syrian text.

There are flaws in *syr sin*, and in many passages we are still seeking for more light, but *Merx* has placed the study upon a higher and a simpler plane, and I could wish that *von Soden* had shown a willingness to sit at *Merx*' feet rather than air his own exceedingly questionable eclecticism. *Soden* opposes *Merx* at Luke xii. 14, Mark xvi. 4, where he certainly should have bowed to his countryman's greater skill.

For assistance in controlling *syr sin* we turn to the Latin witnesses and more particularly to the Codex Bezae. I have considered its text, in something like its present form, to be older than A.D. 200. *Sir William Ramsay*, attacking the problem from yet quite another standpoint, has arrived at the conclusion, from his studies in Asia Minor, that as regards the Acts we cannot date the corrector of D *d* later than approximately A.D. 150-160, and that the foundation text is much older.

I recognise one or two very early correctors in the Codex Bezae, acquainted with Syriac, which of course complicates the problem of the ultimate base, but Bezae, being free from extraneous text influences, has a large value when used in connection with the Syriac documents. Occasionally we find the *persian*, with or without the *armenian*, suggesting the lost *syriac* base, not present even in *syr sin* or *syr cu*. This has still to receive scientific treatment.

When we reach *von Soden*, instead of finding an advance on *Merx* and *Ramsay*'s studies, we find a different state of things altogether. We find that *Soden* is in another class as an investigator and a student, and

---

† His mind worked with great rapidity. Thus he hardly ever italicises or places within inverted commas the frequent Latin or English or French quotations which occur to him as he writes. He quotes, for instance, "Facts are stubborn things," or "Be bold, be not too bold," in the middle of a German sentence without any indication that these are quotations and in another language.

that his vision is circumscribed and Alexandrian. His text is a real mixture and quite unscientific. He is incapable of arguing on the lines of *Merx*, and apparently too much of a schoolman to see with *Ramsay's* sharp and clear vision. The truth is that some half-informed people of an Alexandrian turn of mind, who have never made a study of the idiosyncrasies of documents (except at second-hand), have stampeded the Professors into a belief that the *ultimum verbum* in textual criticism has been said,† and that the *ultima ratio* has been reached. *Soden* suggests an Alexandrian redivivus such as *Hort* was. *Soden's* text is so thoroughly Alexandrian that it falls into line with *Hort*, irrespective of MS evidence. Among other things, it favours the *imperfect* over the aorist, just as the Alexandrians did, and favours the historic present on countless occasions, see Matt. xv. 12 *etc. etc.* As to the imperfect, observe Matt. ix. 9, *ηκολουθει* (*pro ηκολουθησεν*) *Soden*<sup>txt</sup> following *H*<sup>5 2 1016</sup> *I*<sup>a 5 286</sup> *η*<sup>dc</sup> 1266 1353 1443. Yet two verses below, at ix. 11, *Sod*<sup>txt</sup> refuses *ελεγον* (*pro ειπον*) against a larger combination, *viz.* "all *H*<sup>exc 76 (Δ)</sup> *I*<sup>a 600 94</sup> *η*<sup>da 167 f b</sup> 1266 *sb* 1043 1353 1416 1443 541 *it vg*," including this time not only the Latins, but the very MSS followed above, which I have underlined, and the second combination includes BCL *Cyrl* actually missing from the first, where only *Σ* of the *H* family is present. (In the second combination *Soden* should have said "*exc. d k*" after "*it vg*.")

Could anything be less scientific?

So, also, as to the partitive genitive. Observe several places, and note Luke ii. 37, *ουκ αφιστατο του ιερου*, *Soden* with *Hort*, and the small group BF<sup>w</sup>L<sup>EW</sup> 131 604 Paris<sup>97</sup>, to which add of *Soden's* codices only *Sod*<sup>1132</sup>, against everything else for *απο του ιερου* (except D<sup>st</sup> του ναου). Even *Σ* has *εκ του ιερου*. If *Σ* found the preposition absent from his copy, as is probable from his adopting *εκ* and not *απο*, he undoubtedly referred to Latin or Coptic or Syriac, and added the *εκ* from those sources. If he had consulted other Greek copies he would have added *απο*. This is a pretty place as to my contention as to *Σ* and polyglot influences. *Hort* at any rate had the merit of simplifying matters by elevating Codex B to the dignity of an all-powerful arbitrator in any complicated passages. *Von Soden's* text, while evidently enjoying certain solecisms of B or *ΣB*, is so eclectic that its methods are not easy to follow and in certain cases *scriptural terms have been invented* by conflation or mixture of various attested readings. The text is of no use to the real student.

As between *Hort* and *von Soden* ‡ there is no doubt that *Hort* chooses

† Thus Dr. Moffatt in his English translation of the N.T. adopts *Soden's* text as a base.

‡ As these last pages came to me for revision, I received the news of *Hermann von Soden's* sudden and untoward end. I regret that there has been so much to criticise as to his work. I wish I could have seen any way to modify it.



the short-cut to "get there" by electing to adopt B readings in cases of doubt. It is not the royal road; in fact it is the disloyal road, when we consider how many other witnesses he has to put aside. But it has a singular fascination for scholars. It is ingenious and ingenuous, but it will never solve our problems.

Thus, in a variety of three or more readings or orders, *Hort* almost invariably fell back upon B, even when quite alone, so that we know what to expect. It is otherwise with *von Soden's* text. One does not know what to expect, and it ends frequently by getting muddled and not following *any* document.

*Soden's* notes, by whomsoever put together, without any exaggeration, are full of every misdemeanour known to textual criticism. Even *Evsst* 28 is confused with *Evan* 28 (John ix. 27). I knew this must happen when people rushed in apparently armed cap-à-pie for the fray, but forgot the stringent rules of preparation which govern such bouts in whatever connection undertaken.

I do not laud *Merx* because he agrees with me or I with him. But *Merx* reminds one of a mettlesome and blooded horse well and appropriately girded for the tourney, whereas *Soden's* charger is ill accoutred, with his harness indifferently patched, and in danger of its breaking and coming apart, before his rider has crossed a lance.

#### MERX, VOGELS, AND BURKITT.

*Vogels* has done, and is doing, good work, but seems to harp too much on a consanguinity (not necessarily of origin) between D<sup>st</sup>, some *latins*, and *syr cu* (*sin*).

In the Syriac-Greek text, thus brought into clear light again by him, we have to differentiate between three things:—

1. Glosses, or additions to the narrative.
2. Harmonistic matters, which he traces entirely to Tatian.
3. The real base.

*Vogels* drives this second horse very hard, and may kill him.

I would liken this matter to a unicorn team of horses, which, as I know by personal experience, is the most difficult of all combinations to drive; and we can, for convenience, label the horses or their postilions *Burkitt*, *Vogels*, and *Merx*. Thus:



*Burkitt* seems to have confused glosses of the "Western" text with the so-called Western text as a whole. This lead-horse has a very tender

and sensitive mouth, is difficult to drive, and rushes his corners. As in every spike-team, one or both of the wheelers (owing to the close coupling of the lead-bar to the crab of the pole, in the case of a single leader) will frequently follow the leader too quickly when the lead-reins are even slightly touched or looped to make a turn. The near-wheeler with his postilion *Vogels* is apt to do this.

Fortunately *Merx*, the postilion of the off-wheeler, is steady-going and experienced, and on him we depend to arrive safely at our destination. He refuses to be stampeded on the one hand by the baulking, or on the other hand by over-anxiety on the part of the leader, and tries to quiet the anxious demeanour of his wheel-mate, who wants to pull the whole coach himself.

In other words, apologizing for my mixed metaphor, there has been great confusion between *glosses*, *harmonies*, and *base* in the Graeco-Syriac-Latin unicorn coach. But the three things are absolutely distinct, for :

(3) The *Graeco-Syriac* text is often the shortest, *irrespective of synoptic accounts*—hence very likely basic. *Merx* has done good work in his running commentary on *syr sin*, and must not be denied the proper hearing as to this and other cognate matters.

(2) The harmonies visible which *Vogels* insists upon are certainly present in the *Graeco-Syriac* text, or in that part of it represented by *D d* and *syr cu diatess*, but we must not look at this alone. Behind these diatessaric harmonies rests a most ancient base.

(1) The glosses of one or another or of a group of these “*Western*” documents represent frills and clothing assumed much later than either (3) or (2), and are to be kept absolutely distinct and not confused with harmonies or base.

### *The Version Tradition.*

Reduced to its simplest terms the question of the “*Version tradition*” seems to resolve itself into these propositions.

A heavy Syriac influence is visible acting on the Latins (even extending in places to *Tertullian* †), but much more lightly on the Greek mss. It can also be seen extending to the Coptic versions.

A heavy Coptic influence is observed acting on some of our Latin mss (*e ff l*) with nearly as strong a hand.

A Latin reaction of the earliest is visible on *all* the Greek mss, and can also be traced to some extent in the Coptic and Aethiopic versions.

† *e.g. Readings*: Luke xx. 5 *Et quare, inquit Christus, non credidistis ei. Tert<sup>marc</sup> 38*. This + *Et* is Syriac. Luke xii. 53 *dividetur Tert<sup>marc</sup> 29* with *r* and *syr* against the Latins *dividentur* and *Gk* ΝΒΔΤΛΥ διαμερισθησονται.

*Renderings*: John v. 39 “*Scripturas in quibus salutem speratis Tert<sup>Pracorr.</sup> 8* = Burkitt’s translation of *syr cu* (*hiat sin*), although of course the Syriac ܦܝܫܐ is ‘anceps’ or hydra-headed, but *Tert*’s *speratis* is against the Greek *δοκεῖτε* and against all the Latins *putatis* (*a* = *existimatis* as *Gwilliam*’s translation of *syr<sup>peab</sup>* which he changed from *Schaaß*’s “*putatis*”).

*Vogels* and others would attribute the Syriac element in the Latins solely to the influence of Tatian's diatessaron. Historically speaking there is this much foundation for the opinion in that Victor of Capua seems to have found a Latin version of the diatessaron, and so far no traces remain of a Greek MS of the diatessaron. But there are objections to this view, for the diatessaron does not seem by any means the only responsible factor in the matter of Syriac influence on Latin, and it seems more probable that Tatian's foundation text, upon which he formed his Syriac diatessaron (if it was originally in Syriac), was a bilingual or polyglot embracing *Gr-Syr- & Lat*, which was current in Rome A.D. 150.†

It is rather to the credit of the Latin versions that they bear traces of Syriac influence, for it shows that the second-century scholars referred to a Syriac version for elucidation of Aramaic points when in doubt as to correct Greek or Latin rendering of the phraseology of and of the points connected with a story whose background was essentially and inseparably Semitic. The story having been given to the world in a Greek form and dress, the Greeks themselves were no doubt content to hold to the Greek text, as do more modern scholars, but the Latin and Graeco-Latin MSS exhibit a different attitude. Hence the 'Western' text links up with the 'Eastern' or Syriac, and the Greek text goes over to Alexandria and Greek Egypt to be remodelled.

In the earliest times the written Gospel was not planned. St. Peter, when he heard of Mark's work (we are told), "neither approved nor disapproved of it." In St. Peter's lifetime then he had not foreseen the need for it. The preaching of his eye-witness seemed sufficient for the times; but that was in the early stages of the ministry, and the people were soon clamouring for the records in written form, and we may be sure (although history vouchsafes nothing on the point) that in that misty period of the apostolic-sub-apostolic age, between A.D. 60 and 120, men were comparing the records,‡ people of different languages were

---

† This is not the place where I can discuss the "earliest stratum of the Latin text." A key passage like John viii. 55 *καὶ ἐν τούτῳ οὐκ οἶδα αὐτόν, ἐσθλαί ομοίως ὑμῶν ψευδῆς* yields however this amount of information, that *Tertullian*<sup>Prax 22</sup> has it thus: "*Et si dicam non novi, ero similis VESTRI mendax*," whereas all other Latins have *vobis* with *υμῶν* of ABDW and a few minuscules (limited to 1 52 138 157 254 2<sup>a</sup>) to which add *Sod*<sup>200</sup> (*test. Beermann et Gregory*). This may or may not signify that all the other Latins post-date *Tertullian*, but it reveals *Tertullian's* Latin version (for I cannot consider that he made the translation himself) in accord with the majority of Greek evidence. ... "Since, moreover, you are close to Italy you have Rome, from which there comes even into our own hands the very authority" (of these "authentic writings," see above) *Tert*<sup>Praxcr. 22</sup>.

‡ Cf. all of *Tertullian's* forty-four chapters in his "*Prescription against Heretics*," and note (iv) "adulteri evangelizatores," (vii) "whence spring those 'fables and endless genealogies' and 'unprofitable questions' and 'words which spread like a cancer'..." Away with all attempts to produce a mottled Christianity of Stoic, Platonic, and dialectic composition..." See also ch. viii. and all the following.

insisting upon being fed by the Word in their own speech, capable translators were at work, and scholars were immediately engaged in comparing these versions.

We are apt to think, in our pride of twentieth-century scholarship and achievements, that things are different now to what they were then. My mind, however, conceives of just the same criticism in vogue then as now (large traces of which have come down to us in the sketches and remnants of the diverse heresies of the second and third centuries, into which *Tertullian* enters fully) and doubtless the criticism of the written Word was keen and the comparison of the versions extensive. Hence also, from the marginal annotations of the disputing factors of the early second century, have descended to us many various readings which had their origin in that early age and not in any other.

### *The Verdict asked.*

We have now completed the arraignment of Codex B in the Gospels, referring to a similar condition of the B text elsewhere, and have presented the facts upon which the jury should base their verdict. My arguments have been cumulative rather than exhaustively elaborate. I could have elaborated and gone into much greater detail as to many matters simply mentioned or only sketched. I have preferred to write for those who can appreciate a cumulative argument, which I hope I have at least outlined to their satisfaction. The verdict asked is whether B represents a "neutral" text or not. The claims put forward by us are that B does *not* exhibit a "neutral" text, but is found to be tinged, as are most other documents, with Coptic, Latin and Syriac colours, and its testimony therefore is not of the paramount importance presupposed and claimed by Hort and by his followers. That B is guilty of lâches, of a tendency to "improve," and of "sunstroke" amounting to doctrinal bias. That the maligned *textus receptus* served in large measure as the base which B tampered with and changed, and that the Church at large recognised all this until the year 1881—when Hortism (in other words Alexandrianism) was allowed free play—and has not since retraced the path to sound traditions.

In addressing the jury for the last time, I would remind them of the salient features in this investigation, and ask them to bring to bear upon the situation their good common sense.

*Von Soden* has divided the Greek mss into certain families:

*H* family (headed by B, but including  $\aleph$ CLWZ,  $\Delta\Psi$ , and the minuscules 33 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> and *Sod*<sup>337</sup>).

*I*<sup>a</sup> family (headed by D and including W (in Mark) *Sod*<sup>206</sup> 28 372 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 and *Sod*<sup>337 1337</sup>).

the *fam* 1 (*Sod I*<sup>a</sup>, subdivisions <sup>a</sup><sup>b</sup>),  
the *fam* 13 (*Sod I*<sup>a</sup>, subdivisions <sup>a</sup><sup>b</sup><sup>c</sup>).

A large family *I*<sup>4</sup>, subdivisions <sup>a b c r</sup> (headed by J and including M, the important cursive 71 and over twenty others).

Family *I*<sup>s a and b</sup> headed by the important minuscule 348.

„ *I*<sup>o</sup> headed by U and 213 and including Laura<sup>A 104</sup> and Soden's critical codices <sup>581 1110</sup>.

„ *I*<sup>u</sup> covering the four purple uncials ΝΣΦ and Π.

„ *I*<sup>o</sup> headed by 157 and including four others.

„ *I*<sup>ka b c</sup> headed by the Codex Alexandrinus with KII and a dozen cursives including the important 270 (*Sod*<sup>291</sup>) and 280 (*Sod*<sup>294</sup>).

„ *I*<sup>r</sup> covering Λ and four cursives.

„ *I*<sup>1</sup> covering ΓΔ, a very critical family, including c<sup>α</sup> *Sod*<sup>178</sup> † *Sod*<sup>541</sup> *Sod*<sup>2443</sup> and eighteen others.

The commentary families **A** (= XX<sup>b</sup>Ξ), *K*<sup>v</sup> (of several mss), **C** (of at least five members), **N** (of at least five members).

Also *fam* *K*<sup>1</sup> headed by Ω with V and five cursives.

Also *fam* *K*<sup>1</sup> composed of the uncials EFGH.

I am sorry to bother the jury to carry so much in their heads, but cards can be obtained by them with this information printed in detail, which they can hold in their hands and consult while considering the following very simple questions:

When διασαφισον (*pro φρασον*) Matt. xiii. 36

and διερχομαι (*pro ερχομαι*) Jno. iv. 15

were found in NB, the readings commended themselves to Tischendorf, Hort, and von Soden ‡ as being excellent, neutral and basic.

These expressions convey an *ampler* and fuller sense as to *explaining* the parable of the tares in the wheat, and as to the woman's *repeated* toil || in coming to the well. Origen used both these expressions.

According to the critics, when *Lucian* engaged in an "Antioch" revision of the text, he came across these words and thought they were too explanatory, so he substituted φρασον and ερχομαι. In other words he abandoned the better for the worse (or simpler) expressions.

Now turn to the card and observe that *Lucian* and the poor *textus receptus* are not alone involved in this absurdity, but *all* the rest.

Of the *H* family all other members oppose.

Of the *I* families all oppose except *Sod*<sup>550</sup> and <sup>48</sup> which have διασαφισον in *Matthew*, but these also have ερχομαι in *John* and not διερχομαι.

We have therefore to assume, if διασαφισον and διερχομαι are basic, that all the stupid scribes who copied the rest of the *fam H* mss, all the originators or scribes of the recensions *I*<sup>a</sup>, *I*<sup>n</sup>, *I*<sup>1</sup>, (*I*<sup>4</sup>), *I*<sup>β</sup>, *I*<sup>o</sup>, *I*<sup>r</sup>, *I*<sup>u</sup>, *I*<sup>κ</sup>, *I*<sup>r</sup>, *I*<sup>1</sup>, *fam*<sup>A</sup>, *fam*<sup>C</sup>, *fam*<sup>N</sup>, *K*<sup>1</sup>, *K*<sup>1</sup>, when they came to these places made

† This really belongs with *Sod*<sup>1110</sup> in family *I*<sup>o</sup>.

‡ Soden adopts the first but not the second.

|| So the twenty scholars who made the 'Twentieth Century New Testament' from Hort's text translate "nor have to come all the way here to draw water."

identically the same ridiculous alterations and reduced the good, expressive, and ample "*explain*" and "*come repeatedly*" back to the simple "*tell*" and "*come*." No trace remains, it may be remarked incidentally, of any half-way-house interpretations.

It seems unnecessary to call your attention again to other cognate matters. The plain fact will appeal to you and enable you to render a proper judgment on the *other* issues when you have reconsidered these two simple matters, and recovered critical judgment, which *Origen* abused, for he doubtless was responsible for *διασαφήσον* and *διερχομαι* which impressed *Hort* as being ingenuous, forcible, and basic, instead of being disingenuous, and merely of an 'improving' tendency.

You will therefore absolve *Lucian* of the crime of bad revision of the neutral text in these and in other places, and render a verdict that "Antioch" holds the true base in many places, where a few ill-advised but well-meaning Alexandrian "scholars" tried their hands, all too successfully, at this same task of revision, which has appealed to modern Alexandrian *redivivis* with such strange persistency.

For you *must* render a verdict on my appeal to a Court superior to that of the Revisers of 1881, as they are found both to enjoy and to have perpetuated in the Revised Text *διασαφήσον* and *διερχομαι*.

In rendering your verdict it would be interesting to have your views upon the character of *Hort's* foundations, theories, and critical principles. They are deeply involved in a consideration of these two substitutions. For instance, *Soden* refuses *διερχομαι*, but falls into line for *διασαφήσον* and other kindred alterations upon identically the same authority. *The Revisers* and *Soden* refuse *ἦεν* (for *αἶπει*) in Jno. x. 18, which *Hort* had adopted upon the joint testimony of *Σ* and *B*. Where is then the solid foundation of *Hort's* system? What becomes of the theory that *B* pre-eminently holds the "neutral" base as against others?

Again, if *Σ* and *B* went apart "close to the autographs," how much closer to the autographs must some of our cursives have gone apart, for they retain in places an apostolic and sub-apostolic base when they agree with *Clement of Rome*, *Ignatius*, *Justin*, or the *Old Syriac* against *ΣBD* and the rest of the *H* or *I<sup>a</sup>* families.

Lastly, as regards *what* influenced *ΣB* to engage in certain revision, we must consider *Version* influence upon them. If this is seen and recognised, the "neutral" foundation falls away, the props are withdrawn, and the theories as to this foundation melt into air.

Leaving aside the possible version influence upon them of what they saw opposite *φρασον* to influence them to substitute *διασαφήσον* as an amendment, you have only to turn the pages of my brief to be convinced that concurrent version influence is visible all along the line upon *Σ* and *B*.

What of *καναναιος* (*pro κανανιτης*) Matt. x. 4 by *BCDL* (*cf. lat*); of *ναζαρηνον* (*pro ναζωραιον*) Luke xxiv. 19 (*cf. lat*); of *Ευγε* (*pro Ev*) Luke xix. 17 (*cf. lat*); what of *αιρει* (*pro ζητει*) Matt. xvi. 4 by *B*?

What of the *syriac* *μαριαμ* (for *μαρια*) found in B?

What of Luke xvi. 3 *σκαπτειν ουκ ισχυω και επατειω αισχυνομαι* found in B only of Greeks but with *syrr sah boh* and *aeth*?

What of the *Coptic* sympathy at:

*Mark* xiv. 18 *των εσθιοντων*

„ xiii. 32 *αγγελος*

*Luke* xi. 36 *+ εν (ante τη αστραπη)*

„ xxiii. 50 *αγαθος δικαιος (- και)*

} B quite alone with Coptic.

Consult also in places pure syriac, coptic, or latin *order* adopted eclectically as the mood seized B or its parent.

As to *Σ* you will find in the appendix to my brief (Part II.) ample matter for reflection. The instances are too numerous to be mentioned here.

The Version influence affects *Σ* and B in *different places*.

Perhaps you have not given sufficient attention yet to this feature.

Observe then the same character of influence on the text of C or W, L or Ψ, 1 or 13, 4 or 7, 21 or 22, 28 or 157, 33 or 213, 348 or 604, 892 or Paris<sup>97</sup>, c<sup>act</sup> or Sod<sup>371</sup>, Sod<sup>1084</sup> or Sod<sup>1443</sup>, all in *differing places*, and you will open your eyes, and by your verdict the eyes of the Professors and of the Public, to a state of things unrecognised hitherto, and which must be considered in dealing with the basic text. I leave the matter confidently in your hands, relying on your sound common sense.

### *Hortian "heresy."*

"Nisi quod humane temeritatis, non divine auctoritatis negotium est haeresis, quae sic semper emendat Evangelia, dum vitiat.—*Tert*<sup>Maro</sup> iv. 4

Upon the first page of this book I spoke of the "Hortian heresy." Upon this last page I would fain explain what it is that I accuse of being a heresy.

The text printed by Westcott and Hort has been accepted as "the true text," and grammars, works on the synoptic problem, works on higher criticism, and others, have been grounded on this text. If the Hort text makes the evangelists appear inconsistent, then such and such an evangelist errs. Those who accept the *W-H* text are basing their accusations of untruth as to the Gospellists upon an Egyptian revision current 200 to 450 A.D. and abandoned between 500 to 1881, merely revived in our day and stamped as genuine.

It is not as if we do not know what to expect from these Egyptian documents. We do know. I have open around me, as I write, the different authorities. When I am dealing with St. Mark's Gospel I know perfectly well what to expect when I consult Δ. I know that Δ is going to fall into line with *ΣB* right through the Gospel, and I am

hardly ever disappointed. It is practically the same document. When I look at  $\Sigma\Phi$  I know that in the main they are against  $\Sigma B$  here.  $L$  goes with  $\Sigma B$  generally as elsewhere.  $C$ , I know, will sometimes go with them and sometimes not. When I turn to  $\Psi$  I am hardly ever mistaken. It runs almost invariably with  $\Sigma B$ . But when I look at  $W$  I never know what to expect. I know  $a$  will bear away from the other Latins and show positive Greek reaction. Of *syr sin* I am never sure, while  $b$  nearly always helps me to good basic traditions. As to *sah* and *boh* they are not certain as allies of  $\Sigma B$ , so that in some cases one knows what to expect and in others one does not.

The plain fact is that  $\Sigma BCL\Delta\Psi$  really represent but *one* document, and that one at variance with all others; but, as explained elsewhere, it is anything but a "neutral" document.

I can almost hear the opposition saying "Why here he admits the steady flow of a 'neutral' text." But it is not "neutral"; it is purely Egyptian. Every new document recovered from Egypt points the same way. The new fragments published by *Amélineau* grouped under the letter  $T$  are proof positive. Let those who do not agree with me take the fragment  $T^1$  and compare it with  $\Sigma B$  and  $Co$ . It falls into line as a regular adherent, yet in some of their sub-singular readings it refuses to follow, showing exactly where the sub-editing took place in  $\Sigma$  or  $B$ .

The "Hortian heresy" opened the way to endless other pseudo-scientific heresies. Thus Robinson Smith, dating from Iffley near Oxford, has written a paper for the October 1913 number of the 'American Journal of Theology' concerning St. Luke's dependence on Josephus. The case as to this is most unconvincingly stated, but on the last page he goes out of his way to fall foul of St. Luke in these gracious and conservative and helpful terms:

"That is not Luke's method of paraphrasing. On the contrary, he usually, or at least frequently, lowers, not heightens, effects; his sole aim apparently was to tell the story in his own words, and his sole method was to change his originals, *result as it might* . . . I think it can also be shown that the resemblances between passages of Luke and John are not, as has been held, corrections of Luke by John, *but dilutions of John by Luke*: that the order of the Gospels is therefore Mark, Matthew, John, Luke; and the dates I place, tentatively, at 60, 80, 95, and 100 A.D. But the present task of the higher critic is not to fix exactly the dates of the Gospels, *but by the elimination of Luke* to see exactly what they tell us . . . *Luke has indeed much to answer for*; indeed, it is an axiom of scholarship that when a historian is found wanting in reasonable accuracy *he is not to be trusted at all*. But it is an axiom of common sense that 'we should not try to get more out of an experience than there is in it,' and we should err grievously if we threw all of Luke's writings overboard simply because, where we can watch him, *he so often flees from the truth*."



Previously Smith had said :—

"First, and in general, this: that precisely as Luke has been eliminated as *historically worthless and untrustworthy* in all of his palpable derivations from Mark, so must he be eliminated in all that he, and he alone, has in common with Matthew, such as the *distorted* and widely scattered sayings found in Luke of the Sermon on the Mount. *About three-fourths or three-fifths of Luke is thus set aside as negligible if not actually harmful*, and our knowledge of Christ becomes at once more definite, if also to some extent more circumscribed."

The author of this tirade [another *Marcion* come to judgment] has the effrontery to close his article, after accepting in toto the parables of the Prodigal Son and the Good Samaritan, with these words:

"And in thinking of his writings as a whole, we do well to remind ourselves that if we possessed only the Gospel according to St. Luke, every Christian knee would still bow."

And this is offset only ten lines above by the statement previously quoted: "that when a historian is found wanting in reasonable accuracy *he is not to be trusted at all.*"

The accusations as to the detail of St. Luke's misdemeanours [outside of the ridiculous rehearsed nonsense about Josephus] are to be found on the first page of the article, and resolve themselves chiefly into these trivial, not to say pitiful, selections. I quote the learned author:

"Proceeding, then, with the other lines of evidence that point to Matthew's priority over Luke, we shall consider first such Markan phrases as were changed by Matthew, before they were again changed by Luke. (1) Mark 6: 3: 'Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?' becomes Matthew 13: 55: 'Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary?' which in turn becomes Luke 4: 22: 'Is not this Joseph's son?'† (2) Mark 6: 4: 'A prophet is not without honour, but in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house'; which is shortened to Matthew 13: 57: 'A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country, and in his own house'; which in turn is shortened to Luke 4: 24: 'No prophet is accepted in his own country...'

What such shortening by Luke has to do with his accuracy as a historian I do not see. Besides which the longer phrase in Mark vi. 4 is not certain, textually speaking.

As to St. Luke's general reliability, we have a better witness than Robinson Smith, for St. Paul, the fellow-traveller of the beloved physician, not only seems to quote St. Luke's words rather than St. Matthew's‡ as

† See Knox in 'Some loose Stones' (p. 45) for a cogent and delightful bit of argument here as to the untenable character of the modern scholars' whole hypothesis, which is shown to contain complete self-contradiction.

‡ 1 Tim. v. 18 λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή· βούν ἀλοῶντα οὐ φιμώσεις (= Deut. xxv. 4)

καὶ ἄξιός ἐστις ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ

= Luke x. 7 ἄξιός γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ

whereas Matthew x. 10 = ἄξιός γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ.

Scripture, and has thus set his seal upon Luke (before 65 A.D.), but in his second epistle to the Corinthians (viii. 18) has these commendatory remarks :

“συνεπέμψαμεν δὲ τὸν ἀδελφὸν μετ’ αὐτοῦ οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν,”

which have generally been taken to apply to St. Luke.

And *Tertullian*<sup>Marcion iv. 5</sup> says: *Nam et Lucae digestum Paulo adscribere solent. . . Lucae autem quod est secundum nos.*

It is easy enough to turn the tables on the hypercritics by pointing out that it may be St. Mark who “flees from the truth” by amplification rather than St. Luke who “distorts” Scripture by a shortening process.

St. Luke writes in iv. 40 Δυνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου

St. Mark „ „ i. 32 Ὁψίας δὲ γενομένης ὅτε ἔδυ ὁ ἥλιος

St. Luke v. 15 διέρχεται δὲ μᾶλλον ὁ λόγος περὶ αὐτοῦ

St. Mark i. 45 Ὁ δὲ ἐξελθὼν ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν πόλλα καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον . . .

St. Luke vi. 3 ὁπότε ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ

St. Mark ii. 25 ὅτε χρεῖαν ἔσχεν καὶ ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ

St. Luke xi. 18 εἰ δὲ καὶ ὁ σατανᾶς ἐφ’ ἑαυτὸν διεμερίσθη πῶς σταθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ ;

St. Mark iii. 26 καὶ εἰ ὁ σατανᾶς ἀνέστη ἐφ’ ἑαυτὸν ἐμερίσθη καὶ οὐ δύναται στῆναι ἀλλὰ τέλος ἔχει

St. Luke viii. 6 καὶ ἕτερον κατέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν

St. Mark iv. 5 καὶ ἄλλο ἐπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ πεπρωδὲς ὅπου οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν

St. Luke viii. 8 καὶ φυνὲν ἐποίησεν καρπὸν ἑκατονταπλασίονα

St. Mark iv. 8 καὶ ἐδίδου καρπὸν ἀναβαίνοντα καὶ αὐξανόμενον

St. Luke viii. 24 καὶ ἐπαύσαντο καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη

St. Mark iv. 39 καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη

St. Luke viii. 39 ὑπόστρεφε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου

St. Mark v. 19 ὑπάγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου πρὸς τοὺς σοὺς

St. Luke *ibid.* καὶ διηγοῦ ὅσα σοι ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός

St. Mark *ibid.* καὶ ἀπάγγειλον αὐτοῖς ὅσα ὁ κύριός σοι πεποίηκεν καὶ ἐλέησέν σε

St. Luke viii. 41 παρεκάλει αὐτὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ

St. Mark v. 23 καὶ παρακαλεῖ (*vel* παρεκαλεῖ) αὐτὸν πολλὰ λέγων ὅτι τὸ θυγάτριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἔχει (*καὶ θέλω*) ἵνα ἔλθῶν ἐπιθῇς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ ἵνα σωθῇ καὶ ζήσῃ

St. Luke viii. 47 ἰδοῦσα δὲ ἡ γυνὴ ὅτι οὐκ ἔλαθεν τρέμουσα ἦλθεν

St. Mark v. 33 ἡ δὲ γυνὴ φοβηθεῖσα καὶ τρέμουσα εἰδυῖα ὁ γέγονεν αὐτῇ

St. Luke	viii. 52	ὁ δὲ εἶπεν μὴ κλαίετε
St. Mark	v. 39	καὶ εἰσελθὼν λέγει αὐτοῖς τί θορυβεῖσθε καὶ κλαίετε ;
St. Luke	ix. 28	. . . εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι
St. Mark	ix. 1	. . . εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἰδίαν μόνους
St. Matt.	xvii. 1	. . . εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἰδίαν
St. Luke	xviii. 23	ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας ταῦτα περίλυπος ἐγένετο
St. Mark	x. 22	ὁ δὲ στυγνάσας ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ ἀπήλθεν λυπούμενος
St. Luke	xviii. 30	πολλαπλασίονα ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ
St. Mark	x. 30	ἐκατονταπλασίονα νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ
St. Luke	xxi. 4	ἅπαντα τὸν βίον ὃν εἶχεν ἔβαλεν
St. Mark	xii. 44	πάντα ὅσα εἶχεν ἔβαλεν ὅλον τὸν βίον αὐτῆς
St. Luke	xxi. 30	ὅταν προβάλῃσιν ἡδη
St. Mark	xiii. 28	ὅταν αὐτῆς ἡδη ὁ κλάδος ἀπαλὸς γένηται καὶ ἐκφύῃ τὰ φύλλα
St. Luke	<i>ibid.</i>	γινώσκετε ὅτι ἡδη ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἐστίν
St. Mark	xiii. 29	γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἐστὶν ἐπὶ θύραις
St. Luke	xxii. 12	. . . δείξει ἀνάγαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον
St. Mark	xiv. 15	. . . δείξει ἀνάγαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον ἑτοιμον
St. Luke	xxiii. 26	. . . Σιμ. τινα Κυρην. ἐρχόμενον ἀπ' ἀγροῦ
St. Mark	xv. 21	. . . παράγοντά τινα Σιμ. Κυρην. ἐρχόμενον ἀπ' ἀγροῦ
St. Luke	xxiii. 35	. . . ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, σωσάτω ἑαυτὸν . . .
St. Mark	xv. 32	. . . ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι . . ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ πιστεῦσωμεν
St. Matt.	xxvii. 42	ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι . . καὶ πιστεῦσωμεν ἐπ' αὐτόν
St. Luke	xxiv. 1	Τῇ δὲ μᾶ τῶν σαββάτων ὀρθρον βαθέως . . .
St. Mark	xvi. 1, 2	Καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου . . καὶ λίαν πρωὶ τῇ μᾶ τῶν σαββάτων. . .

We have been taught that the "shorter" text is not only the more desirable but must represent basic conditions of *Λογια* or of "Q."

Why should St. Luke then "flee the truth" here because he gives us the shorter accounts? Why should not St. Mark have amplified the accounts? Why are we to be forced into acquiescence in the theory that Mark formed the basis for Matthew and Luke in these synoptic passages, if it was not the imaginary "Q"?

As to St. Luke "fleeing the truth," as against unnecessary Semitic redundancy in Mark, the matter is ridiculous. Supposing St. Luke did use St. Mark, was it necessary for him to *copy* word for word. I suppose St. Luke could have employed someone to copy Mark had he wished to do that. He simply supplements Mark, giving us those wonderful

parables that all the critics accept. Why cannot they leave the beloved physician alone, if, writing for Greeks, he prefers his own language as a historian?

As to the Josephus business it is not creditable to seek to make Luke dependent on Josephus, when on similar occasions we are assured that sub-apostolic Fathers are not dependent on the N.T. writings but on a "lost source common to both." We cannot argue both ways. If this be true of sub-apostolic Fathers we must allow St. Luke and Josephus also to be dependent on a common lost source.

As to the Gospel of John,† Burkitt treats it as of no account whatever. But the *grounds* of this disbelief apply equally to the Gospel of Mark, for quotations from Mark are practically nil in the earliest times. The critics first sought to destroy St. John's Gospel as a historical document. Next they decided that St. Matthew's Gospel‡ was not prior to that of St. Mark, although the earliest Patristic testimony is all in favour of St. Matthew. Now Smith tells us that St. Luke is an absolute liar. We are left with Mark, the shortest in matter, the most ample in substance. Yet it has not as great claims to historic priority, as evidenced by early quotations, as the other Gospels. Are we eventually to be left with nothing? Is all this fine criticism simply bent upon pulling the house down upon its ears?

I take the liberty of speaking out thus without mincing matters because no one else seems to care to do so, and to handle the matter with gloves and soft phrases seems to me would be unfaithful.

Shall we not do well to attend to the *textual* side of the problem before indulging in the vain imaginings and superficial flights of the "higher" criticism? Are we really better and more capable critics than *Tertullian*? *Tertullian* does not consider that St. Luke "distorted" the sermon on the mount.

† Yet *Tertullian's* order is (1) John, (2) Matthew, (3) Luke, (4) Mark (*cf.* Scrivener's and Gregory's Introductions) and *Tertullian's* words (against Marcion iv. 2) are: "Denique nobis fidem ex apostolis Johannes et Matheus insinuant, ex apostolicis Lucas et Marcus instaurant."

‡ But see the refutation of this in 'S. Mark's indebtedness to S. Matthew,' by F. P. Badham (T. Fisher Unwin, London, 1897), and note the lists in chapter iii. Then read the words of introduction there and run on to ch. iv. p. 38 for the continuation of the author's summary, as follows:—

"Of course in many of these cases, considered separately, the obligation might be in either direction—S. Matthew might have pruned, toned down, &c.—but considering them all together one can see that there is a unity on the positive side and not on the negative. To suppose that S. Matthew had predilections exactly antithetical to those of S. Mark is to suppose a literary miracle...What an extraordinary conception of S. Matthew we are driven to by the hypothesis that the precise vivid details of S. Mark are original! For these details are absent from S. Matthew one and all, and if the Matthaean narratives are to be derived from those in St. Mark, the conclusion is inevitable that the author of the former was unprecise, unpicturesque deliberately!"

*Dean Inge on St. Paul.*

"How do ye say we are wise and the law of the Lord is with us? Lo the false pen of the scribes hath wrought falsely" (Sept: "In vain hath wrought the false pen of the scribes").†—Jerem. viii. 8.

Before concluding I wish to pass in review a still more recent article (Jan. 1914) in the *English Quarterly Review* on "St. Paul" by the Dean of St. Paul's.

In the list of authorities under review heading his article I miss the German writer *Drews*' scurrilous and unscholarly volume entitled *THE CHRIST MYTH*, in which he wrote (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., p. 207, on "*the Pauline Jesus*"):

"At the present day it will be acknowledged by all sensible people that, as Ed. von Hartmann declared more than thirty years ago, *without Paul the Christian movement would have disappeared in the sand just as the many other Jewish religions have done* ;"

yet *Dean Inge* takes precisely the same line as *Drews*, and, while perhaps he may not be pleased to be coupled with *Drews*, it is clear that the same school of thought animates the infidel and the Churchman. *Dean Inge* sums up thus (p. 68):

"It is impossible to guess what would have become of Christianity if he (Paul) had never lived; *we cannot even be sure that the name of Jesus would still be honoured amongst men.*"

Thus the same view is held by the atheist and antichrist *Drews* as that put forth soberly and solemnly at the close of his article by a high dignitary of the Episcopal Church.

Is it true then that without Paul Christianity would be dead?

To accept this view is to deny the Paraclete's presence, to deny the Saviour's Godhead, and to belittle God the Father to a degree!

If instead of following *Drews*, it had been said by *Dean Inge* that Paul happened to be the Master's "chosen vessel" to convey the message to the Gentiles, that his letters had been inspired by His grace, and preserved to us by His agencies, it would have been sufficient. As it stands the Dean's expression seems to point to the survival of Christianity depending *fortuitously* upon Paul's personality—surely a very travesty of the Christian verities!

Unfortunately modern "scholars" delight in the crudest and most irreligious utterances, if they can only thereby show that they are free and untrammelled thinkers.

There were many others besides Paul. In the *Didache* for instance (that ante-Barnabas document) occurs a sentence even more noble than any appearing in 1 Cor. xv., viz. (Did<sup>iv</sup>.<sup>8</sup>):

εἰ γὰρ ἐν τῇ ἀθανάτῳ κοινωνοὶ ἐστέ, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς θνητοῖς.

The trouble is that the 'scholarship' of the last few years is

† A-V is apparently "conflate."

painfully arrogant and seems to think that it has made great discoveries. All this appears in the Dean's article again and again. He says:

- (p. 46) "*It is only in our own day that the personal characteristics of St. Paul have been intelligently studied... It has been left for the scholars of the present century to give us a picture of St. Paul as he really was...*" (Then he goes on to describe the picture: "—a man much nearer to George Fox or John Wesley than to Origen or Calvin." This is almost laughable. Have 'modern scholars' discovered this indeed? The only suggestion I would offer is that the comparison is a little inverted. George Fox and John Wesley were men much nearer to St. Paul than to Origen or Calvin. Why should St. Paul take the low place in the form of the comparison?)
- (p. 47) "The 'Pastoral Epistles' are probably not genuine, though the defence of them is not quite a desperate undertaking."†
- (p. 52) "A curious indication *which has not been noticed* is that as he tells us himself he five times received the maximum number of lashes from Jewish tribunals."
- (p. 63) "The Evangelist whom we call St. John is the best commentator on Paulinism. *This is one of the most important discoveries of recent New Testament criticism.*" Indeed!
- (p. 66) "...though it is only recently that this character of the Pauline churches has been recognised."

(The Dean has been fondling the word 'mystery-religion' and applying it to St. Paul's Christianity and Churches; one sentence runs: "Second, the promise of spiritual communion with *some Deity*." Observe the calculated subtlety of the comparison here between the mystery-cults of the Greeks and the mystery-religion of the Christians).

As to the quotation from p. 47—"The Pastoral Epistles are probably not genuine"—who says so? Only *some* critics; ‡ and these gentlemen are never agreed among themselves on other matters. Yet the Dean reads from these same pastoral Scriptures in public, and accepted them (1, 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon) when ordained, which ordination embodied a continuous declaration, not to be put aside at will by anyone while still within the Church. The question is "Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament?" Answer: "I do believe them." I am aware that a movement is on foot to modify this declaration (which would indeed open the way to a grand muddle), but the adage of a great churchman—

"Philosophia quotidie progressu, Theologia nisi regressu, non crescit"—

†† Ramsay: 'The Church in the Roman Empire,' pp. 248 and 365 note, accepts them as genuine. How then can Inge write as he does when a modern scholar such as Ramsay, of surpassing eminence, endorses them? Dean Inge himself, speaking at the Lyceum Club (circa May 10, 1914), is reported to have referred to "the advice *which St. Paul gave to Timothy*," and then to have quoted 2 Tim. ii. 3!

may be recommended to these progressive churchmen. If we abandon the Epistles to Timothy today, the critics of tomorrow may restore them.† If we abandon Ephesians‡ today, its Pauline authority may be fully established tomorrow.

In order to accept the views which 'modern scholarship' presses upon us in so cavalier a fashion, we must believe that *Tertullian* and *Irenaeus* before A.D. 200 were worse judges of the Canon than critics of today. *Tertullian* does not hesitate to use Ephesians|| as a Pauline epistle and sets his seal on both epistles to Timothy as Scripture in many places.

In *Tertullian's* treatise *de pudicitia* he quotes from 1 Tim. i. in chapter xiii. several times. Then follows this up in chapter xiv. by using the apostle's own description of himself in 1 Tim. i. 1 and 2 Tim. i. 1. He writes <sup>Padic xiv. near the end :</sup>

"ne scilicet *Paulum apostolum Christi*, doctorem nationum in fide et veritate, vas electionis..."

He also quotes from *Titus* and has confirmed *Philemon* in <sup>Marcion v. 21 :</sup>

"To this epistle alone did its brevity avail to protect it against the falsifying hands of Marcion. I wonder however when he received [into his Apostolicon] this letter which was written to but one man,¶ that he rejected the two epistles to Timothy and the one to Titus, which together treat of ecclesiastical discipline."

Is *Tertullian* then not a better witness than *Marcion*? Must we class Dean Inge also with the Marcionites? What better proofs do we require than *Tertullian's* express testimony? Can the 'modern scholars' give us anything as ancient *against* the Pauline authorship? For *Marcion* is clearly out of court and always has been.

Or is it that 'modern scholars' are impatient of 'ecclesiastical discipline,' referred to by *Tertullian* as contained in the letters?

To whom but St. Paul himself can 1 Tim. i. 13 refer?—

"...formerly being a blasphemer and a persecutor and an overbearing ungovernable man. But I obtained mercy because I did it ignorantly in unbelief"; or again :

2 Tim. i. 16, 17 "The Lord give mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus, for he oft refreshed me *and was not ashamed of my chain, but when he was in Rome he sought me out very diligently and found me*"; or again :

„ i. 9 "Wherein I suffer evil *unto bonds as a malefactor, but the word of God is not bound*"; or again :

„ iii. 11 "Persecutions, afflictions, what things befell me in

† The arguments against them are absolutely inconclusive.

‡ P. 47 : "Of the rest the weight of evidence is slightly against the Pauline authorship of Ephesians."

|| Whether this epistle was addressed to those at Ephesus or elsewhere matters not.

¶ See Bishop Wordsworth's very beautiful remarks about the letter to Philemon.

Antioch, in Iconium, in Lystra, what persecutions I endured. But out of them all the Lord delivered me"; or again:

2 Tim. iv. 11 "Only Luke is with me";

„ iv. 14 "Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil."

Again and again in the pastoral epistles there are exhortations to avoid foolish questions, babblings, endless genealogies, profane and old wives' fables, "for (2 Tim. iv. 3) the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine."

Is that time upon us?

In order that readers may not think that I am unaware of any "new" arguments against the genuineness of the pastoral Epistles and that such exist, I will frankly confess that I know of no 'new' arguments against them, and I venture to say that neither does the Dean of St. Paul's. Threadbare arguments there have been, briefly referred to by that excellent critic Bishop C. Wordsworth in his N.T., p. 434, as to the peculiar phraseology of the Epistles—arguments which he dismisses in a few well-chosen words; but of *new* arguments against them by 'modern scholars' where are they, Mr. Dean? I think they are in Marcion's locker. Certainly the suggestion that the heresies referred to in the Epistles are of later date than St. Paul's times is absolutely inconclusive and *not even probable*.†

We cannot afford to be divorced from the 'Pastoral Epistles' in this summary fashion. We regard them as some of St. Paul's most inspired utterances against the wicked unbelief and misbelief of 'the last times.' Thus the closing admonition of the 1st Epistle to Timothy covers the ground magnificently in one sentence:

"O Timothy, the (sacred) deposit guard (carefully), turning away from the empty babblings and oppositions OF SCIENCE FALSELY SO CALLED, which some professing, have failed ('missed the mark' R-V marg) ‡ concerning the faith."

(Ὁ Τιμόθεε τὴν παραθήκην (or παρακαταθήκην, the meaning is the same) φύλαξον, ἐκτρεπόμενος τὰς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας καὶ ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως, ἣν τινες ἐπαγγελλόμενοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἡστούχησαν). ||

Has the Anglo-Saxon race outgrown its Bible and the four-fold Gospel narrative? To hear the Dean one would think so. He writes (p. 45): "We know very little in reality of Peter and James and John, of Apollos and Barnabas. *And of Paul's divine Master no biography can ever be written.*"

† See Dr. Lindsay's explanation of the weakness of Harnack's position (p. 140 note, 'The Church and the Ministry in the early centuries,' London, 1902).

‡ ἡστούχησαν A-V 'erred,' but the meaning is stronger: 'failed.' Thrice is this word used in Timothy. Elsewhere at 1 i. 6 and at 2 ii. 18.

|| The verse has been challenged as a later addition, but on flimsy grounds.



Observe the absence of the word *adequate*. The Dean does not say "and of Paul's divine Master no *adequate* biography can ever be written," but simply "no biography can ever be written." We seem to feel that he means "no biography *has ever been* written."

What is he trying to teach? That the Gospel-narrative is untrue, or only so imperfect that it is useless to 'modern scholars'? Why always harp on the insufficiency of our documents to portray all that went on in those days in Galilee? This spirit of unrest is not scholarship; it is simply "denying the power." Oh, for winged words to combat these stupid heretical suggestions!

For suggestions they are. Suggestions full of guile, emanating from the false teachers,† false apostles,‡ false brethren,§ false prophets,¶ in our classrooms; suggestions that Peter's memory failed him, that Mark suppressed things, and John introduced questionable stories; that Luke changed and embroidered, and that none of the Gospellists told the truth!

'Modern scholars' love to touch on the forbidden ground of the speculative philosophies which St. Paul so often condemns in his pastoral epistles. They touch upon it and withdraw, but the harm for the reader is done. Thus on p. 60, of course the Dean does not mean that he approves of any idolatry, yet here is the *wording* of the sentence: "In addressing the Gentiles, we may assume that he followed the customary Jewish line of apologetic, denouncing the folly of idolatry—an aid to worship *which is quite innocent and natural* in some peoples, but which the Jews *never understood*."

Reduced to plain English what does this mean?

Does it mean that although the Jews did not understand it (is "never" quite accurate, by the way?), idolatry is nevertheless helpful?

Again, pp. 66/67: "It is useless to deny that St. Paul regarded Christianity as, at least on one side, a mystery-religion . . . It was as a mystery-religion that Europe accepted Christianity . . . And students of the New Testament have not yet realised the importance of the fact that St. Paul, who was ready to fight to the death against the Judaising of Christianity, was willing to take the first step, and a long one, *towards the Paganising of it*. It does not appear that his personal religion was of this type. He speaks with contempt of some doctrines and practices of Pagan mysteries, and will allow no 'rapprochement' with what he regards as devil-worship. In this he remains a pure Hebrew. But he does not appear to see any danger in allowing his Hellenistic churches to assimilate the worship of Christ to the honours paid to the gods of the mysteries, *and to set their whole religion in this framework*, provided only that they have no part nor lot with those who sit at 'the table of demons'—the sacramental love-feasts of the heathen mysteries."

† 2 Peter ii. 1.

‡ 2 Cor. xi. 19.

§ Gal. ii. 4.

¶ Matt. vii. 15, xxiv. 11, Mark xiii. 22, 1 John iv. 1.

Now what in the name of common sense does all this mean? Of course 'modern scholars' understand the tone, the wording, the lesson (is there one?) pervading this kind of high-sounding talk. But from a churchman to churchpeople it is un-Pauline and un-ecclesiastical. It is walking unconcernedly on dangerous ground. It is hinting always at an undercurrent of unbelief latent in the 'modern scholar's' inmost soul.

Either we have God's true religion and our mystery-cult is absolutely un-pagan and unlike any other in the world, or for *Deus* let us substitute *Di* and be done with it, and wipe out all Paul's striving to inculcate the lesson of "the one true God."

But this is not nearly all. For close after this comes another astonishing sentence:

"There is something *transitional* about all St. Paul's teaching." This curious λόγιον is left unexplained and followed by a perfectly harmless ten lines (bottom of p. 67), but the sting of the word remains. There is nothing *permanent* then about the foundations of Christianity as preached by Paul? What does the excellent Dean mean? That things which might offend the modern feminine suffragist are to be found in Paul's teaching? But he has just disallowed the Epistles in which the major part of this teaching occurs! We have to give it up.

But the Dean is not a consistent writer anyway, for on p. 60 he says first of Paul's language: "His Greek, though vigorous and effective, is *neither correct nor elegant*"—and then a few lines below: "Regarded merely as a piece of poetical prose 1 Cor. xiii. is *finer than anything that has been written* in the Greek language since the great Attic prose writers."

And is this also a modern discovery?

I have said that Dean Inge is not consistent. We find another instance on p. 50. Under verbiage and somewhat elaborate language he seeks to impress us with the scholar's profundity, yet his study of Ramsay (cited among his authorities on the first page) is not profound enough for him to avoid direct and unnecessary antagonism to Ramsay's views as to St. Paul's family.† Dean Inge writes (without in the slightest degree indicating that this is opposed to Ramsay, whom he is reviewing *inter alios*):

"St. Paul did not belong to the upper class. He was a working artisan, a 'tent-maker,' who followed one of the regular trades of the place."

Ramsay accounts quite otherwise for St. Paul's poverty, and I cannot but think that Ramsay has the better and more solid foundation for his views. In as fine a passage as one can find in his works, and with an almost unerring instinct for happy solutions and inspiring views, quite above the clap-trap of the schools, Ramsay describes the scene at home after St. Paul's conversion, the bitter words which must have passed

---

† Succinctly stated on pp. 81/87 of 'St. Paul the Traveller.'

from father to son, incidentally exhibiting, by an 'e silentio' method, the reality of St. Paul's conversion, the certainty of his heavenly vision, and the permanence of his new views as to religion. He pictures the final break with home ties, and our apostle become a wanderer upon the face of the earth; then, and only then, driven to take up a trade for his living. Not that he learned the trade then, for in accordance with custom he had doubtless learned it at home, but that after leaving a comparatively affluent family 'milieu' he had to face the world alone for the first time.

Again, a cruel and subtle endeavour is made by referring the 'thorn in the flesh' of St. Paul to a predisposition to epilepsy—here again our good Dean is following Drews—to account for his 'visions' and the matter of his conversion.

It is as subtle as it is cruel, and as cruel as it is subtle, for it is introduced some distance away from the main theme of the conversion, which is discussed as follows:

"What caused the sudden change which so astonished the survivors among his victims? To suppose that nothing prepared for the vision near Damascus, that the apparition in the sky was a mere 'bolt from the blue,' is an impossible theory. The best explanation is furnished by a study of the apostle's character" (observe the subtlety of the allusion) "which we really know very well. . . ."

"The vision came in the desert, where men see visions and hear voices to this day. They were very common in the desert of Gobi when Marco Polo traversed it. The 'spirit of Jesus,' as he came to call it, spoke to his heart, and the form of Jesus flashed before his eyes.† Stephen had been right; the crucified was indeed the Lord from Heaven. So Saul became a Christian; and it was to the Christianity of Stephen, not to that of James the Lord's brother, that he was converted."

Here the Dean comes out more into the open. Reduced to plain English it is this. Paul was an epileptic. The vision he saw took place during such an attack. He imagined that Jesus had appealed to him, but the vision was no more real than any other which other men from that day to this have experienced in the same neighbourhood. He was really converted by pondering over Stephen's attitude and steadfastness.

Turning back to p. 51 you will find how the Dean falls into line about this epilepsy theory. He guards the matter slightly. "He was liable to mystical trances in which some have found confirmation of the supposition that he was an epileptic." That sounds mild, but close by he goes on to add that the belief of 'some' is also his belief; for he says: "He suffered from some obscure physical trouble, the nature of which we can only guess. It was probably epilepsy." He then proceeds to say: "But these abnormal states were rare with him; in writing to the

---

† The Dean means as an epileptic.

Galatians he has to go back fourteen years to the date when he was 'caught up to the third Heaven.'" This serves a double purpose, implying the epileptic fits were rare but none the less real although connected with heavenly visions. But does not Dean Inge see that the ground is untenable? No man, subject to epilepsy, would have dared to imperil the efficacy of his message by falling down in a fit at a critical moment. That surely 'va de soi' as to Paul's character. Secondly, the long interval between visions stamps them as quite exceptional and as having nothing to do with epilepsy, for an epileptic subject could never have gone through the long series of trials and privations and hardships which fell to the lot of Paul without a frequent recurrence of the malady.

Nothing loth, however, Dean Inge continues (p. 52):

"At that time anyone who underwent a psychical experience, for which he could not account, believed that he was possessed by a spirit good or bad."

This is the modern method of argument. If the epilepsy suggestion does not work, fall back on a statement such as this, to destroy man's belief in anything superterrestrial. In plain English: "If Paul's visions were not due to epilepsy, at any rate he was mistaken in thinking he had been near the third Heaven or had any intercourse with the unseen world." Or in other words: "We plain matter-of-fact twentieth-century theologians reduce all these things to terrestrial terms. We have nothing to do with the extra-terrestrial. We profess to believe in God and Jesus Christ whom He has sent from Heaven, but really we do nothing of the kind. We would like to, but the full evidence, you know, is wanting, and pending further light we must just behave like common-sense mortals." †

Not content with the denial of the reality of Paul's communion with Christ, Dean Inge also falls foul of St. Luke's predilection for the supernatural. He has entirely failed to see that if a physician can believe in the supernatural a churchman can also do so, but, as I say, that is beyond the churchman of today. He sees the miracle of the awakening Spring and "passes by on the other side," seeking and praying for "more light."

This is what the Dean has to say of St. Luke (p. 48): "...a man of very attractive character; full of kindness, loyalty and Christian charity. He is the most feminine (not effeminate) writer in the New Testament, and shows a marked partiality for the tender aspects of Christianity. *He is attracted by miracles* and by all that makes history picturesque and romantic." This sounds delightful, but wait only a few lines (p. 49): "The narrative is coloured in places by the historian's *love for the miraculous.*" Our critic, observe, does not in his certificate of good character say that St. Luke is either 'sober' or 'truthful.'

---

† One of these days, however, a man who does *not* believe in 'miracles,' or anything extra-terrestrial, will be considered crude, ignorant, uneducated and incapable of apprehending inter-cosmic phenomena (see article by Sir Wm. Barrett, F.R.S., in *Contemporary Review* for June 1914).

According to the Dean he is neither. The Dean, like Robinson Smith, makes no apology for calling St. Luke a liar. And I make no apology for putting this plain interpretation into the Dean's mouth, for here is what he says (only seven lines further down):

"*The Greek historian invented speeches for his principal characters; this was a conventional way of elucidating the situation for the benefit of his readers. Everyone knows how Thucydides, the most conscientious historian in antiquity, habitually uses this device, and how candidly he explains his method. WE CAN HARDLY DOUBT THAT THE AUTHOR OF ACTS† HAS USED A SIMILAR FREEDOM, though the report of the address to the elders of Ephesus reads like a summary of an actual speech.*"

Could disguised venom, wrapped up in the soft qualifying and slightly guarded phrases of the modern school, go further?

This kind of thing ecclesiastics do not seem to consider either dangerous or heretical. I write as a layman and I solemnly assure them that they will reap a whirlwind from this wicked sowing. For wicked seeds they are, put forth for our comfort and edification (God save the mark!).

Can it be possible that ecclesiastics not only forget the Master's admonitions "Let your communication be yea yea, nay nay, for whatsoever is more than these (*περισσὸν τούτων*) is from evil (*ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἔστω*)," but that they scurrilously suggest that our Lord's own sub-followers were addicted to falsehood and to the literary affectations of the times in delivering their solemn message? Messieurs les Ecclésiastiques, allow me as a layman to say that such a suggestion is not only unworthy but scandalous. And you have no proofs of it to offer.

What you do offer us is an extrinsic and emasculated Christianity as far removed from the real thing as is your own doctrine from that which you impute to Paul with his pure mysticism (p. 53), "The mystical doctrine of the Spirit of Christ immanent in the soul of the believer, a conception which was the core of St. Paul's personal religion," only you spoil it by using the expression "a conception," as if Paul had 'conceived' it and it was not after all real!

Away with your half-truths and your innuendoes or you will soon preach to empty benches.

The early Church which lived according to the precepts of the *Didache* had many notable Evangelists besides St. Paul. Like some of Paul's letters their names have perished or are only briefly recorded in the lists of Paul's co-workers, but who can stand in the silent chambers of the private burial places of great Roman-Christian citizens of the first century and not realize that Peter's message, as well as Paul's, that the

---

† Just above, the Dean practically admits the Lucan authorship of Acts. (This comparison with Thucydides evidently comes direct from the classroom of some University lecturer.)

messages of Luke and Mark and John and Justus, and Apollos, as well as those of Timothy, of Silvanus, of Philemon and Sosthenes, of Titus and Onesiphorus, Urbanus and Stachys and Apelles, of Crescens and Clement, of Tychicus and Artemas, of Erastus and Trophimus, of Ampliatus, of Persis, of Zenas and Apollos, of Archippus, of Epaphroditus, Epaphras and Aristarchus, of Philologus, of Asyncritus and Patrobas, of Epaenetus, Rufus, Hermes, Hermas, Phlegon, of Eubulus, Pudens and Linus, of Tertius Paul's scribe, of Apphia, Prisca and Aquila, of Claudia, of Phebe, of Tryphaena and Tryphosa and Julia, contributed to the continuity of the Christian Church apart from Paul himself.

These all standing shoulder to shoulder † fought the heretics of that day: Hymenæus and Philetus, Phygellus and Hermogenes, Demas and the rest. They fought them to a standstill for a time. But we,—we,—we dally with heresies and toy with fire. I do not lay myself open to the rebuke that the above-named represent St. Paul's own converts, for they do not, all of them. Besides St. Paul confesses himself to have been refreshed by *others* (1 Cor. xvi. 17): "But I rejoice at the presence of Stephanas and Fortunatus and Archaicus, for that which was lacking on your part these have fulfilled. For they have refreshed (*ἀνέπαισαν*) ‡ my own spirit as well as yours (*καὶ τὸ ὑμῶν*). Recognise therefore such as these (good) men."

Their preaching must then have been, like that of Paul himself, productive of far-reaching results.

Again (Rom. xvi. 7): "Salute Andronicus and Junias my kinsmen, and my fellow prisoners who are of note among the apostles, who also have been in Christ before me."

Two things stand out here, first that some of Paul's kinsfolk were of the Faith, and secondly a humble recognition that he, Paul, was still the "least of the Apostles," and that the other workers were doing as great a work as he himself.

Has the Dean forgotten St. Paul's growth in grace? As his ministry flourished, so he himself becomes more humble. As Christ from the 'good shepherd' (John x. 11) becomes the 'great shepherd' (Heb. xiii. 20) and then the 'chief shepherd' (1 Pet. v. 4), so St. Paul decreases: A.D. 57 "I am the least of the apostles" (1 Cor. xv. 9)

A.D. 61/3 "less than the least of all saints" (Eph. iii. 8)

A.D. 65? "... sinners, of whom I am chief" (1 Tim. i. 15)

In the light of this what does Dean Inge's sentence mean on p. 54?—

"It does not seem likely that a man of so lofty and heroic character was ever seriously troubled with ignominious temptations."

† Didache<sup>xii. 2</sup> πυκνῶς. "πυκνῶς δὲ συναχθήσεσθε ζητοῦντες τὰ ἀνέκοντα ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν."

‡ The same word as at Matt. xi. 28 "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest."

Yet he starts his article thus (p. 45) :

"With St. Paul it is quite different. He is a saint without a luminous halo. His personal characteristics are too distinct and too human to make idealisation easy. For this reason he has never been the subject of popular devotion. Shadowy figures like St. Joseph and St. Anne have been divinised and surrounded with picturesque legends; but St. Paul has been spared the honour or the ignominy of being coaxed and wheedled by the piety of paganised Christianity."

It is Inge therefore who in the sentence on p. 54 elevates St. Paul further above other mortals than the Church has ever elevated St. Joseph or St. Anne!

'Tis a curious bit of writing on p. 54, and implies a strange sub-conscious strain in the mind of the Dean.

But if St. Paul "turned the world upside-down" it was only to assist in founding through *others* the glorious heritage which is ours to-day, not by human agency, not by any St. Paul—as Drews and Inge suggest—but by Divine agency permitting certain instruments to stand out above others, but only "by permission."

This article by the Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral is cold-blooded, and not really scholarly. The whole message is tinged with phrases which sound ill in a Dean's mouth.

Thus his disquisition on the God of the Old Testament (p. 54/55) is a lurid example of what not to write. "The distinctive feature of the Jewish religion is not, as is often supposed, its monotheism... And when Jahveh became more strictly 'the only God,' the cult of intermediate beings came in and restored a quasi-polytheism..." What is the Dean talking about? Of Israel's pure religion or of its lapses?

This is dealing with the matter from a purely literary standpoint, a point of view which ruined Westcott and Hort's work on the New Testament text, and a standpoint which is as foreign to the spirit of the glorious Gospel as anything that can well be imagined. To become entangled in folk-lore and to dissociate Paul's personal religion from his teaching (pp. 53, 63, 66) is undignified, to say the least.

Progress is barred, gentlemen, unless we return to the "old paths," *for there can be nothing new* in the religion of Jesus Christ. Either there was one authoritative revelation, and one sacrifice once for all, *or there was not*. No *via media* exists. All this beating about the bush leads but to confusion and apostasy, "and if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" (1 Peter iv. 18). There is one royal road and only one, and that was clearly indicated by others besides St. Paul. If Paul had never lived the message would have lived on.

Therefore when Dean Inge, following Drews, says:

*"It is impossible to guess what would have become of Christianity if he (Paul) had never lived; we cannot even be sure that the name of Jesus would still be honoured among men,"*

we lift our hands in horror and exclaim : Is this a Dean writing ? Is this his message of consolation to the afflicted, the sin-sick and the sorrowful ? Has he understood his hero at all if he writes thus of him ? Would not St. Paul himself be the most shocked of all of us to read this utter reversal of the divine order of events ?

The Dean means (I will presume this in all charity) that St. Paul was the instrument chosen of God to be the chief missionary to the nations. If he means only this it is nothing new, and no new discovery of these latter days !

But if he means that Paul by a series of fortuitous visions during epileptic attacks had false views, had imaginary communion with Jesus Christ, preached a pure but vain Gospel on shadowy grounds, was not "a chosen vessel" but a self-appointed advocate of a religious mystery-cult, and but for this delusion would never have preached and written, and that it was owing to St. Paul's delusions that the western world embraced Christianity, then I say it is time to call a halt and ask these clerics to put their articles into plain and unphilosophical English that we may understand, we laymen, what is before us, and decide whether or not to leave "the Church."

In the words of Jeremiah (xxiii. 32) :

*Behold, I am against them that prophesy false dreams, saith the Lord, and do tell them, and cause my people to err by their lies and by their lightness ; yet I sent them not nor commanded them ; therefore they shall not profit this people at all, saith the Lord.*

Let us turn on the other hand to a more helpful view of such matters.

When a Frenchman applies himself seriously to a deep study I find his reasoning more cogent, his conclusions more exhaustive, his explanations more luminous, his summaries more definite, and his entire critical attitude more scientific and profound than the similar series of mental or psychic efforts on the part of a German, an Englishman, or an American.

I would therefore commend a very bright comprehensive and thorough-going synopsis of New Testament criticism by *André Arnal*, Professor of Theology at Montauban, which reached me recently from a friend, and which appeared in the mid-February number for the current year of a periodical called *FOI ET VIE*, published in Paris. The article is entitled "*Le Nouveau Testament devant la critique*," and will help many to a clearer view of the great issues which are so often confused and befogged in the mass of semi-philosophical and pseudo-scientific critical literature which rushes at us from every corner of so-called Christendom.

I will quote one pregnant sentence towards the close of this twenty-two column article, and urge my readers to obtain and read the whole article for themselves. It will do them good, from Dr. Sanday and



Dr. Harnack down through the rank and file of our critics. They will probably agree with every word which Dr. Arnal has printed, and yet their doctrine is not set forth at all in the same way. We miss the dignified constructive character in their works.

Here is Dr. Arnal's summary :

"Il faut qu'au savoir parfois un peu amer que donne la critique s'ajoute le savoir, infiniment plus précieux, que donne l'expérience religieuse personnelle ; à l'étude qui veut comprendre doit s'unir la prière qui ne veut qu'adorer. Les deux ne sont pas nécessairement liées : *c'est pourquoi il y a des savants qui manquent de foi, et des croyants qui manquent de connaissance.* NI L'UN NI L'AUTRE CONDITION NE SONT ENVIABLES POUR QUI VEUT ÊTRE UN TÉMOIN DU CHRIST..."

"Neither the one (attitude) nor the other condition is desirable for anyone who wishes to be a witness for Christ." This is a true saying. The "savants qui manquent de foi" are summed up in 2 Tim. iii. 7: "*Ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.*" In the same chapter the "croyants qui manquent de connaissance" are assured that the real man of God, to be "complete and thoroughly furnished unto all good works," must be thoroughly versed in the Scriptures.

So, insensibly, Dr. Arnal almost uses the language of this Pastoral Epistle to illustrate his point, and yet we are asked by such as Dean Inge to doubt that St. Paul wrote the Pastoral Epistles. Well, if he did not, *a greater than Paul* then was faithful enough to warn us of the last times!—to warn us of those "having a form of godliness but denying the power thereof," and so we find that if Paul had never lived, the name of Jesus would *not* have been forgotten among men, for the writer of the Pastoral Epistles has kept alive the deepest truths and teachings of the Christian religion.

Sublime epistles! whether of Paul or of Apollos or of another mighty servant of God!

Did a second-century forger then invent the introductions to both epistles?—

(1 Tim.) Paul an apostle of Jesus Christ by the commandment of God our Saviour, and Lord Jesus Christ which is our hope, unto Timothy my own son in the faith. . . .

(2 Tim.) Paul an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, according to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus, to Timothy my dearly beloved son. . . .

Perish the thought that these sublime prologues of "life" and "hope" in Christ Jesus should not be from the pen of Paul. But,—if they and the epistles themselves are *not* of Paul, then Dean Inge's contention falls to the ground of its own false-weight, for the name of Christ *would* have lived on among men by means of these short and superb epistles, even if Paul's other universally acknowledged writings had perished, or if he himself had never lived.

*Conclusion.*

Our daily actions are based as much on the experience of the past and upon the probabilities of the future as upon our own *knowledge* of what a day may bring forth. We live, in other words, by Faith. But Faith seems to have abandoned the circles where the cult of both the higher and the lower criticism flourishes. Those in these circles desire facts and tangible proof, like Thomas, demonstrative evidence, τεκμηρίον as St. Luke calls it (Acts i. 3), and do not seem to seek this evidence in the proper direction. To revive the Egyptian textual standard of A.D. 200-400 is not scientific, and it is certainly not final. The truth is scattered over all our documents and is not inherent entirely in any one document, nor in any two. Hort persuaded himself that where NB were together (as for ἦεν instead of αἶπει at John x. 18) they must be right. This kind of fetichism must be done away with. Other documents having the same base must be consulted for the necessary "control" in these passages of N and B, such as the cursives 892 and Paris<sup>97</sup>. Nor can we lightly disregard W when in opposition to NB.

A reference to the quotation from Hippocrates on our title-page may not be out of place here. The aphorism was well rendered into French by A. de Mercy in 1811:

*La vie est courte, l'art est long, l'occasion passe vite, l'expérience est trompeuse, le jugement difficile.*

*Le médecin doit non-seulement faire ce qui convient, IL DOIT ENCORE FAIRE CONCOURIR LE MALADE et ceux qui l'entourent et les choses externes.*

Oh for the Faith of him healed by Peter and John in the name of "Jesus Christ the Nazarene," the result of which is described by St. Luke in the medical term ὁλοκληρία "perfect soundness" (Act iii. 16). May "perfect soundness" in matters of doctrine and of criticism be restored to us, so that like another blind man healed by the Nazarene Himself in a twofold operation, we may "look up and see all things clearly" (Mark viii. 25).

## END OF PART I.

THANK GOD, ALL THE SHIFTING TO AND FRO OF TEXTS, ALL RECENSIONS AND REVISIONS, AND ALL VARIOUS READINGS, CANNOT TOUCH OR ALTER THE WHOLE BODY OF TRUTH AS WE HAVE IT REVEALED TO US IN HOLY SCRIPTURE; BUT THE SLUMBERING DEPTHS OF GOD'S ETERNAL COUNSELS SHALL REMAIN EVER SAFE FROM THE RIPPLES MADE BY THE BREATH OF MAN ON THE SURFACE OF HIS WORD.—S. C. Malan. From the Preface to 'St. John's Gospel translated from the eleven oldest versions,' London, 1862.

## POSTSCRIPT.

Referring to pp. 252/255 *in re περι or ὑπερ*, it is to be noted that in the fragment of an "uncanonical Gospel" just published (Vol. X., March 1914, *Oxyr*<sup>1224</sup>) by Grenfell and Hunt, we meet with the expression, on folio 2 recto col. 1 :

*και προσευχεσθε υπερ των εχθρων υμων*

and the general language of the fragmentary context of this early fourth-century document is more akin to St. Luke's diction than to St. Matthew's.

## GENERAL INDEX.

- N** *Preface* p. ii *et passim* *Vide* Part II.  
**N**, methods of 45 46 47 50 54 note 58 89 94 113 129 note 147 (viii. 7) 228 note 239 257 309 and note  
 328 332 337 note 353 note ‡ 356 392 394 400 407 426, and see Part II.  
**N** and **B**, differences between *Introduction* p. viii, 75 note, and Part II.  
**Abbott**, Edwin A. 388 341  
 Accusative absolute, see "Change of case."  
 Addition for the better 278 295  
 Addition for the worse 295  
 Additions and omissions, oscillation between 289  
 Ethiopic 28 79 347 435 *seq. passim*, *et cf.* Part II.  
**Alexandria** and **Carthage** 199 205  
**Alexandrian** text and readings 9 11 *seq.* 27 and note 75 note 80 81 91 110 202 250 266 290 316 355  
 362 372 373 374 387 416 note 422 459 *et alibi*  
**Alexandrian** writers and critics 41 66 149 note 265 346 376 note 461 *et alibi*  
**Amélineau** 353 355 360 371 469  
**Amphilochius** 19 *et alibi*  
**Anacoluthon** 276  
 "Anceps" 315 *et alibi*  
**Anne**, St. 484  
**Antioch** revision *Preface* p. iii, 35 39 42 47 55 79 110 230 243 246 248 250 251 270 286 314 324  
 329 350 355 362 363 375 407 433 457 459 *et passim*  
 ἀπαξ λεγόμενον 294  
**Aphraates** 453  
**Aristides** 422/3  
**Aristotle** 413  
**Armenian** 343 *et passim*  
**Arnal**, Dr. André 485 *seq.*  
 Article (definite Greek), adding or withholding 74 190/1 218 note 220 272 279 298 302 308  
 Article (indefinite Coptic) 218 279 376 *et alibi*  
**Athanasius** 11 12 *etc.* 27 note 29 203 299 307 374 393 420 422 452 *et saepe*  
**Athenagoras** 424/5  
**Augustine** 85 108 278 436  
 "Authorised" version 305 322 350  
**α** and **Β**<sup>α</sup> 54 note 286 344 369 *et alibi*  
**α** and **Δ**<sup>α</sup> 127 and note 128 140 161 note 178  
**αγαθος** and **καλος** 202 note  
**αλλα** and **ει μη** 150  
**αλλα γε (και)** 293  
**ανευ** and **χωρις** 202 note  
**απανταω** and **υπανταω** 24 *seq.*  
**απεναντι** and **κατεναντι** 31/2  
**αχρη**, see under **εως**  
  
**B** *passim*; *cf.* 268  
**B**, the corrector of 325

B, photographic edition 48 269 270

B and boh 6 *et alibi*

B and a 54 note 286 344 369 *et alibi*

B Sinai and Alexandria 318

B and Origen in conflict 69 *seq* (Matt), 121 *seq* (Mark), 237 297 *seq* (Luke), 408 (John)

B alone followed by W-H [not counting evidence new since Hort's death] 2 8 5 6 19 23 32 74 80 81  
83 85 (*marg*) 209 (*pluries*) 211 212 213 (215) (226) 227 228 237 242  
255 259 260 275 278 299 300 302 308 305 306 307 308 309 310 315  
317 318 319 322 324 351 400

BA " " " " 395

BN " " " " 2 6 19 20 29 61 68 78 83 92 120 211 214 217 219 225 227 228 235 237  
240 261 296 300 302 307 312 322 325 327 354 370 378 388 400

BNL " " " " 119 174 211 233 257 258 261 278 280 290 307 317 318 406

BC " " " " 2 299 308 310 325 331 338 351 *et alibi*

BL " " " " 2 22 30 211 213 215 226 *bis* 256 258 306 307 322 323 392

BT " " " " 2 212 268 337 *etc.*

BH " " " " 209 251

BLM " " " " 242

BLX " " " " 337

B outside the Gospels 416 *seq*

Badham, F. P. 473 note

Barnabas 419 477

Barnard, P. M. *Introduction* p. ix, x, 75 200/3 and 208 note 212 270 377

Basic text 272 *et passim*

Bebb, L. J. M. *Introduction* p. ix note

Belsheim 123 note 144 note

Birch 101 167

Blass 1 72 126 139 note 147 note 247 264 281 285 286 298 294 457 458

Bloomfield 177

Bohairic, date of 23 79 85 86 87 89 100 103 105 228 236 284 297 318 323 331 332 400 422 426

" influence of 79 144 *et alibi*

Bornemann 55 293

Bracketed clauses 321

Buchanan, E. S. 153 and note 165 172 301 383

Burton, Dean *Introduction* p. x, 35 68 307 327 381 383 395 note 391 394 415

Burkitt, F. C. *Preface* p. v, vi, *Introduction* p. ix, x, 13 28 63 121 note 318 324 347 357 note 377  
380 402 408 445 447 462 473

Buttmann 147 note 281

b in Mark 107 129 *seq* 173 note 183 note 443 454 *etc.*

b and d in Mark 181

b at Luke xxiii. 34: 418 note

C (the manuscript) 189 *et alibi*

c<sup>xx</sup> 445 *seq et alibi*

Case, change of, see below

Catacombs 107 130/1

Celsus iii 70

Change of case 32 35 *seq* (Matt) 38 67, 95 *seq* (Mark), 246 (Luke) 281 283 290 291 292, 311 356 *seq*  
(John) 361 396

" " gender 84 98 250

" " mood 29 33 (Matt), 92 (Mark), 243 (Luke) 296 323 349 (John) 417

" " number 38 (Matt) 39 51, 96 *seq* (Mark), 241 249 (Luke), 349 355 (John) 374 385 435

" " order 39 (Matt) 57 58 61, 98 *seq* (Mark), 255 (Luke) 280 284 301 303 305 309 312 314 326  
328 332 336 363 (John) 378 379

" " order, involving change of sense 40 323/4

" " person 360

" " possessive pronoun 361 371 *seq*

" " sense 40 235 294

" " tense 33 *seq* (Matt) 57, 93 *seq* (Mark) 113, 243 (Luke) 262 263 304 305 306 323 338 339  
349 *seq* (John) 400 417

" " tense (historic presents) 41 *seq* (Matt), 101 *seq* (Mark) 122 194, 321 note 348 353 *seq* (John)

- Change of voice 32/33 (Matt), 91 *seq* (Mark), 242 (Luke), 323 327 339 348 (John) 418  
 Change without improvement 119 300 340 353 354 396  
 Chase, see "Ely, Bishop of"  
 Chrysostom 364 403 436 *et alibi* [see Part II. in St. John]  
 Church Fathers, Language of 159 195 *seq* 205 339  
 Church of Rome xii/xiii 8  
 Clement of Alexandria *Introduction* p. ix, 29 132 153 198/204 201 note 212 252 254 and note 270  
     293 299 331 419 *et passim*  
 Clement of Rome 188 194 202 note 243 419 *seq* 467  
 Coincidences 28  
 Comparative or positive 201 203 note  
 Compound Verbs, see under "Verbs"  
 Conflation 74 112 147 168 183 note 185 251 259 note 296 323 (*Soden*) 327 365 373 378 *et alibi*  
 Confusion of eye in writing, or of ear from dictation 77 83 167 185 190 216 219  
 Confusion from diglots 85 86 95 226 231  
 "Const." 197 note 413 note  
 Construction 321 *et alibi*  
 Cook, Canon 9 10 210 256 274 347  
 Coptic (overlying and underlying) 82 note  
 Coptic sympathy with B 20 *seq* (Matt), 79 *seq* (Mark), 208 227 *seq* (Luke) 294, 317 *seq* (John) 320  
     322 352 364 367 378 384 417 455 468  
 Coptic and Latin with B 87 233 290 324 325/32 *etc.*  
 Coptic, real situation as to B and Coptic 22 40 note 79 84 85 227 228 231 232 248 256 259 260 263  
     283 284 325 and note 326 328 330 352  
 Copulas 322 333/4 388 394 395 *et alibi* *Vide* Part II. p. 107/8  
*Coram* 89/90 179  
 Cronin, H. S. 123 note 144 note 188  
 Cross-questioning of witnesses 195 (quotation)  
 Crum and Kenyon *Preface* p. v, 317  
 Cursive testimony, see under "Importance of"  
 Cyprian 14 55 *et saepe*  
 Cyril of Alexandria 306 note 309 316 318 359 392 396 400 413 *et alibi*  
*c* in Mark 132  
  
 D, idiosyncrasies of 129 note 173 note 326 note 460 *et alibi*  
 D and the Greek article 180 181  
 D and Egypt 204 *et alibi*  
 D and Origen 159  
 Dd in Mark 107 127 *seq* 173 195 *seq*  
 Δ in Mark 72 105 110 113 note 119 123 204 note  
 Dative absolute, see "Change of Case"  
 Dative for genitive 356  
 Decretum Gelasil *Preface* p. iii  
 Diatessaron *Introduction* p. xiii, 45 77 230 327 366 434 *seq* 464 *et alibi*  
 Diction of Mark, see under *Mark*  
     " " Luke, " " *Luke*  
     " " John, " " *John*  
     " " Paul, " " *Paul*  
 Didache 482 483  
 Dionysius of Alexandria 197 note 198 265/6  
 Doctrinal 315 399 419/20  
 'Doric' 275 and note  
 Dorotheus *Preface* p. iii  
 Double Greek negative 189  
 Double meanings 30 80 142 169 183 and note  
 Double readings 174/6  
 Draws 474 *seq*  
*καταβη* and *μενω* 402  
  
 'Easier' readings 120 292 331 *et alibi*  
 Editing by B 14 (Matt), 74 (Mark), 208 (Luke), 299 (John) 372

- Egyptian revision Preface p. iii, iv, v, 35 39 44 47 81 83 96 239 281 289 256 271 286 364 370 400  
 415 *et passim*  
 Ellipsis 338 339 340 *et alibi*  
 Ely, Bishop of 408  
 Ephesians 476  
 Ephrem 347 *et alibi*  
 Epilepsy 480 481  
 Epiphanius 26 42 268 327 *etc.*  
 Erasmus 456  
 Error oculi 86 91 181 note 216 231 236 257 269 277 284 294 318 320 323 336 343 364/5 *et alibi*  
 Euphony 338 *et alibi*  
 Eusebius 203 210 262 294 362 443 note *et alibi*  
 Eustathius 26 and note 213 note 438  
 Evang. Ebion. 15 71  
 Evang. Hebr. 325  
 Evau. 22: 56  
 „ 28: Introduction p. viii, 98 note 97 137/8 *et passim*  
 „ 38 and Origen: Introduction p. viii, 4 *etc.*  
 „ 157: Preface p. v, 101 206 208 *et passim*  
 „ 604: 137 138 255 note *et alibi*  
 „ 892: Introduction p. viii, 268 note 270 272 *et passim*  
 „ 579 (Paris<sup>97</sup>): Introduction p. viii, 111 *et passim*  
 „ 597: 236 note  
 „ 2<sup>re</sup>: 138 *et alibi*  
 e and N 309 *et saepe*  
 e and NB 28 *et saepe*  
 e and W 72 *seq* 173 196/7  
 e and Cyp<sup>r</sup> 239  
 εγγιστα and κελευ 185 144 187  
 εινασα and ειπουσα 338  
 eis to 243/4  
 εκεινος 332/4  
 ελγμα and μυγμα 400  
 εμπροσθεν, εναντιον, εναντιον 89/90 179/80,  
 εταρις and ευθεως 149  
 εστιν and proper case following 281/3  
 ευκοτατερον, ευκολως, ταχυν, ραυ and θαυτον 201 203  
 εως, εως οδ, οτ εως αν 6 7 220 221/4  
  
 Facilius 201  
 Ferrar 375  
 Form 23 note 30 58 59 89 214 242 309 337 338 *seq* 416  
  
 Galen 46 412  
 Genitive absolute 137 246 361 *etc.*; see "Change of case"  
 Genitive before the noun 114 233 263 *seq* 264 340 347 362 *et alibi*  
 Genitive for dative 369  
 Georgian version 311 note 365 note 398 394 *et alibi*  
 Gersdorf 264  
 Glazebrook, Canon 304 note  
 Gospel order 473 note  
 Gospels copied separately Introduction p. ix  
 Gothic version 319 note 322 439 *et alibi*  
 Grammatical changes 32 *seq* (Matt), 67 91 *seq* (Mark), 242 *seq* (Luke), 335 *seq* 346 *seq* (John)  
 Greek recensions in Mark differing 140 *seq*  
 Gregory, C. R. 27 48 144 185 note 220 note 360 note 437 440  
 Grenfell and Hunt Introduction p. viii *seq* 488  
 Griesbach 50  
 Gwilliam, G. H. 52 360.  
 γυγνωμα and εἰσι 409  
 γινεται/γενετο 137 181 note 407 *seq*

- Harder" readings 97 106 120 258 271 292 356 379 886 460  
 Harmonistic 44 *seq* (Matt), 89 87 104 *seq* (Mark) 121 208 211 253 254 267 (Luke) 291 324 343  
 372 (John) 382 419  
 Harris, J. Rendel *Introduction* p. viii, 30 note 73 75 84 126 129 note 140 174 195 378 409 note 434  
 Hartmann, Ed. von (quoted by Drews) 474  
 Hawkins, Sir John 16 note 41 67 92 101 115 116 127 130 138 184 161 note 194 268  
 Hanson, Hensley 423 and note  
 Hecaleon 424  
 Hermas 421  
 Hieronymus *Preface* p. iii, vi, *Introduction* p. xii, 290 414  
 Iustus 123 215 292 (*cf. etiam* ἀλλὰ *pro* ἀλλ' *alibi*)  
 Higher Criticism 421/2 473  
 Hippocrates *Titlepage*, 46 409 note 412 487  
 Hippolytus 348 426 *seq et alibi*  
 Historic present, see under "Change of tense"  
 Hobart, W. K. 41 note 46 243  
 Homocarteton 344  
 Homocarteton 30 83 91 105 181 note 189 213 242 323 324 330 343 344 396 note  
 Hopelessness of considering B neutral 361 371 *et alibi*  
 Horner, G. *Preface* p. ii, 16 note 20 28 29 55 note 60 63 73 80 81 87 101 107 108 121 note 144 note  
 229 238 284 261 274 289 303 319 320 323 325 338 344 360 note 386 389 414 422 437 442 444  
 447, and in Part II.  
 Hort's (Dr.) "Critical Principles" *Introduction* p. viii *seq.*, p. 1 *seq et passim*; *et vide sub* B: "B alone  
 followed by W-H" *etc.*  
 Idolatry 478  
 Iustus 39 52 213 419 *seq* 491 467  
 Imperatives, see under "Change of tense"  
 Imperfect tense 41 42 93 102 104 262 and note 321 note *et alibi*  
 Importance of cursive testimony viii 110 278 399 434 *seq* 459  
 Improvement 30 35 40 48 *seq* (Matt) 79 107 *seq* (Mark) 121 211 272 (Luke) 337 350 351 355 359  
 374 (John)  
 Inconsistency of W-H 269 292 *et passim*  
 Indefinite (Coptic) article, see under "Article."  
 Indeterminate passages 296 343 401/3  
 Indirect oration 375  
 Infinitives, see under "Change of tense"  
 Infinitive for the *ἄν* construction 92 94  
 " with and without *τοῦ* 78 210  
 " as to *οὐτε* or *εἰς το* 243  
 Ige, Dean 474 *seq*  
 Ionic" 108  
 Irenaeus 476 *et alibi*  
 Irish texts in St. Mark 182  
 Isacisms 349  
 Isala and DW 181/94  
*καὶ* 456 *seq*  
 Ishb, Professor 77 167  
 Jerome, St. *Preface* p. iii, 96 119 133 165 202 401  
 John's (St.) diction 341 346 356 378 402 *etc.*  
 Joseph, St. 484  
 Josephus 469  
 Justin, martyr 14 69 70 198 note 205/6 254 255 266 419 *seq* 428 467 *et saepe*  
 Kury, the *Preface* p. ii 255 467  
 Kuvencus 17 38 *et alibi*  
 Kenyon, F. G. *Preface* p. v  
 Knox, R. A. 470 note  
*καὶ* 456 *seq*



Kypke 149 note

k and B 14 *et alibi*

k in St. Mark 181 note *et alibi*

κακοποιος etc. 392

καλος and αγαθος 202 note

κτηματα and χρηματα 15 199

κυκλω and εγγιστα 135 144 187

Lake, K. 323 348 note 456

Language of St. Mark, see under *Mark*

Latin agreement of authorities 185 157 note 172 *seq*

Latin basic 89/90 118 126 *seq* 172 *seq* 445 446

Latin sympathy with B 17 *seq* (Matt), 76 *seq* (Mark), 217 *seq* (Luke), 310 *seq* (John) 343 354 859, 417

Latin and Syriac opposed *Introduction* p. xiii, 279 *etc.*

Laura<sup>A 101</sup> 156 note 165 note *et passim*

Leipoldt 318

Lewis, Mrs. 28 121 note 257 304 336

Liddell and Scott 15 149 note 337 *et alibi*

Lindsay, Dr. 477

"Lists" of passages:

απαντησιν/υπαντησιν 25/6

απεναντι/κατεναντι 81 82 90 κατεναντιον 82

γαμος/νυμφων 65

ενεκα/ενεκεν 49

εναντιον/εμπροσθεν, εναντιον 89 179 (coram, ante, in conspectu)

επει/επειδη 65

πρωι/πρωιας 64

"Longer" text 200 203 236 266 288 291 297 and see Part II.

"Lower" criticism 421/2

Lucian *Preface* p. iii, iv, *Introduction* p. xii, 362 466

Lucifer 426 *et alibi*

Luke's diction 41 note 46 216 229 245 *seq* 290 408 *seq* 456 *seq* 457 *seq* 469 *seq* 481/2 *et alibi*

Macarius 390

Malan 358 360 396 401 487

Marcion 202 note 211 240 and note 261 276 287 298 428 *seq* 476 477

Margin, the, and its uses 301 304 and note 307/9 344 *et alibi*

Mark's diction 114 *seq* 133 *seq* 194

Mark's Gospel, geographically considered 207

Mark's Greek recension 118 122 124 126 140/71

Mark's Latin recension 126 *seq* 133 *seq*

Mark's indebtedness to Matthew 473

Marsh's Michaelis 149 note

Marsh, Bishop 10

Matthaei, C. F. 167 317 364 383 323 435 455 456 457, Part II. p. 356

Medical language of St. Luke 41 note 46 407 *seq*

Mercati, Monsignor 440

Mercy, A. de 487

Methodius 225 247 and note 250 *et alibi*

Merx, Adalbert *Preface* p. vi, 1 7 72 113 121 note 123 123 138 145 208 238 257 263 290 295 335

347 426 434 437 438 459 460/463

Mill 398 note 438

Miracles 481 and note

"Modern" suggestions 478 481

Mood, see "Change of"

Moulton, W. F. 92 116 note 301 456 457 459

Murali 123 note

Mystery religion 475 478 *seq*

μεχρι (see under *etc.*)

μυγμα and ελεγμα 400

μικρων and ολιγων 202 note

- asseni 423 426  
 zatives 284/6  
 stle, Dr. 1 133 note  
 'eutral" text 229 255 268 270 280 281 289 310 314 342 347 368 375 380 387 396 401 420 422  
 429 432 *et passim*  
 feutral" and "Western" 268  
 liceties" 58 59 65 242 262 280 283 294 301 376 420 *et alibi*  
 nnus 381 385 374 398  
 mber, see "Change of" and "Transition of"  
  
 umenius 41 413 and note, and see Part II. p. 188 note  
 ission for the worse 296 *et alibi*  
 lative 92 *etc.* (and see under "Change of mood")  
 ler, change of 20 21 39 *etc.* (see under "Change of")  
 gen Preface p. ii, 2 *seq* 8 37 60 122 139 155 note 159 210 218 note 252 note 268 272 283/9 298  
 320 note 323 326 337 344 346 353 355 368 375 380 382 400 402 403/5 414 418 424 435 436 *et*  
*passim* (see also under B against *Origen*)  
 gen's "niceties" 10 37 58 65 218 272 283 286 note 353  
 verwhelming evidence" 52  
 yrynchus papyri Introduction p. viii *seq* 488  
 κληρια 487  
 and τινας i 385/6  
 ω and οὐκ 377  
 ε and εἰς το 243 *seq*  
  
 chymius Preface p. iii  
 'airs" 10 11 note 21 57 58 59 60 note 62 63 64 108 113 118 121 128 214 272 note 301 349 351  
 355 365 376 378 380 381 388 384 385 386 387 388/90 391 393 395 414  
 pias 202  
 pyri Introduction p. viii *seq*, 41 167 266  
 ris" 111 336 note *et passim*  
 rticiples 386 (see under "Change of tense")  
 rtitive genitive 38 212 274 461  
 storai epistles 475 *seq*  
 ul, St. (See St. Paul)  
 rfect tense 339/40 349 *et alibi* (see under "Change of tense")  
 ricope de adult. 334  
 rsian version 15 30 261 303 306 308 332 368 394 396 404 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443  
 449 450 *et alibi*  
 ter of Alexandria 16 27 313 note  
 eter, preaching of' 423 note  
 yron 229  
 ileas Preface p. iii  
 ilemon, genuineness of 475  
 iutus 133 note 176/7 notes  
 onasm, see "Redundancy," and for list of Marcan pleonasm 115  
 lycarp 253 419 *seq*  
 lyglot text 7 18 275 313 417  
 ssessive before the noun 20 21 22 23 24 101 114 233 267 347 *et alibi*  
 e-Alexandrian 270 *etc.*  
 e-Syrian 270 374 *etc.*  
 epositions 52 53  
 " (exchange of) 19 45 47 52 53 58 68 108 219 232 251/3  
 inciples of criticism 1 *seq* 314 *et alibi*  
 'rovincial" handling 163 note *et alibi*; see also Part II. p. 1  
 nctuation 100 273  
 u and υπερ 252/5 488  
 ηθω, πιμπλημι and πληρωω 341/2  
 ισευχομαι 289 and note 252  
 ισφωρεω 289/90

"Q" 41 and note 472

Ramsay, Sir W. 140 459 460 479

Reason for writing this essay 110 *etc.*

Redundancy 51 54 104 112 115 116 118 128 190 201 note 203 269 273 277 279-293

Retranslation 128 136 140/71 172 note 178

Revised Version 66 107 120 268 278 303 305 310 313 314 315 319 note 324 331 341 342 346 351  
354 359 360 369 371 373 377 380 383 384 395 399 note *et alibi*

Robinson, Armytage (Dean of Wells) 423

Sabatier 333 453

Salmon, Dr. facing p. xvi, 1 8/9 347

Sanders, H. A. 124 157 note 200 414

Schaaf 52 360

Schmidtke, A. 251 393

Schmiedel, Dr. P. 23

Scholz 50 138 167 335 344 438 440 455

Scrivener, Dr. 109 167 315 321 note 383 393 457 438

Semitic versions 375 *et passim*

Septuagint 16 note 41 43 53 55/59 63 90 94 113 149 note 194 280 341 393/9 419

"Shorter" text 51 54 76 114 210 211 240 251 258 259 268 270 271 272 273 277 279 281 283 289  
301 318 369 429 *seq* 435 438 *et alibi*; and see "Longer" text.

Smith, Robinson 469 *seq*

Soden, Hans von 27 246 note 373 note

" Hermann von 6 141 414 425 454 461 465 *et passim* (see also Part II. *passim*)

" " " Review of 460

Solecisms of B, see "Unique readings"

Souter, A. Preface p. i and note, ii, v, 3 24 27 48 73 note 83 103/7 119 144 237 note 257 258 263  
283 301 note 308 310 313 314 318 331 341 342 345/7 377 378 381 note 392 383 385 note 391

Spelling 338 and note *et alibi*; cf. "Form"

St. Paul's conversion 480

" " diction 55/6 253 265 note

" " family 479 483

" " growth in grace 483

" " language 479

" " malady 480

" " teaching 479

" " visions 480 481

Swete, Dr. Preface p. iii (and see Part II. p. 188 note)

Symbols of MSS 434

Synonyms 31 *seq* (Matt) 46 49 55 65 67 73 note 80 89 *seq* (Mark) 112 140 *seq* 201, 242 (Luke)  
311/18 340 *seq* (John) 403 416

Synoptic accommodation 24 104 105 106 107 253 254 267 268 273 274 277 280 297 288

Synoptic diction 15 26 27 31 32 33 38 41 note 43 46 48 61 64 67 68 83 84 97 123 135 211 212  
237 275 276 288 292 293 295 296 314 409 410 411 424 note

Synoptic source 41 (and see under "Harmonistic")

Syriac interaction Introduction p. xiii

Syriac and Latin opposed Introduction, p. xiii, 277 *etc.*

Syriac and Latin with B against Coptic 241

Syriac and Coptic with B against Latin 242

Syriac Latin and Coptic with B 241 239

Syriac sympathy with B 28 *seq* (Matt), 88 (Mark), 231 (Luke) 240 274, 300 332 (John) 343

Tatian Introduction p. xii, xiii, 44 195 230

Tense, see "Change of"

Tertullian 14 55 132 140 note 204/5 208 219 249 250 276 300 301 308 329 356 359 370/1 398  
401 425 429 note 449 463 464 471 473 476 *et saepe*

Textus receptus 435 *seq* 456 *et alibi*

Thackeray, F. St. J. 116 note 264 281 293

Theodore Preface p. iii

Theodotus 423/4

Theophilus of Antioch 250 425/6

Theophrastus 412

Thucydides 482

Tischendorf *Preface* p. v, 20 note 23 29 37 41 43 45 47 55 and note 60 80 83 86 87 93 94 100 note 101 106 108 113 117 123 note 144 note 147 157 note 162 note 167 note 185 note 192 note 193 note 196 note 200 204 note 205 213 note 214 226 227 237 238 244 259 268 269 273 275 278 280 283 290 292 294 300 308 309 314 note 318 319 320 321 note 322 323 324 325 and note 326 328 note 329 330 336 339 344 345 350 351 360 note 364 367 371 note 373 375 379 and note 383 385 note 386 389 391 note 393 396 397 399 404 405 note 407 note 429 note 432 435 436 437 438 440 442 445 446 449 450 452 453 455 459

Transition of number 55 *seq*

Tregelles 99 238 295 382 442

Turner, C. H. *Preface* p. v, *Introduction* p. vii *seq*, 23 195 347 350 note 412 *seq* 427 428 457

τεκμηριον 487

τινας and οὗς i and 985/6

τοῦτον 284

Underlying Greek text 313 328 *et alibi*

Unique readings in B 14 *seq* (Matt), 74 *seq* (Mark), 208 *seq* (Luke) 266, 299 *seq* (John)

ὁμων and ὅμων 356 *seq*

υπερ and περ 252/5 488

Valentinians 70 424

Verbs, simple and compound *Introduction* p. x, 54 59 109 228 229 248 255 275 284/5 288 292 294 344/7 (Jo. iv. 15)

Verdict, the 465

Versions, influence of 65/66 357/8 375 378 462 *et passim*

"Version tradition" 313 346 463 *seq et alibi*

Vogels, H. J. 462

Voice, see "Change of"

W 72 77 81 82 note 99 102 note 118 136 143 150 151 173 183 239 note 240 note 249 251 414 *et alibi*  
*saepe*

W b 178 note

W d 182

W e 72 130 173 196/7 *et saepe*

W b e 78 199 200 *etc.*

"Wanderwörter" 438

Westcott 139 406

Western non-interpolations 271

"Western" text 8 259 268 271 377 *et passim*

Wetstein 109 118 167 344 398 note

Wiclif 56 note

Winer, 'Grammar' of 57 note 92 94 218 note 264 281 285 296 293 301 456 457 458

Wordsworth and White 54 note 119 311 393 note 414

Wordsworth, Bp. C. 476 note 477

χηματα and κτηματα 15 199

χαρις and αρεν 202 note

FOR THE LIST OF SCRIPTURAL QUOTATIONS OCCURRING IN BOTH PART I. AND PART II. CONSULT  
THE INDEX AT THE END OF VOLUME II.

**Note - This book was originally posted FREE at [www.archive.org](http://www.archive.org)**  
*Many other Free Ebooks available there.*

### *Books for your consideration*

It would be a mistake to suggest that we agree with all of the books we will list below. No book or author is perfect, and neither is this list.

However, there is material in these sources, that do relate to the topic of the book in which this list is found, and these Ebooks are therefore listed for your potential consideration.

Agree or disagree with them, Freedom of Choice and thinking belong to each individual. Make up your own mind.

Codex B and Allies by Hoskier (review of Vaticanus, Sinait. and NKJV)  
Relevant to all versions and manuscripts, including Tischendorf, Wescott & Hort, J White, Burgon, Riplinger, Cumbey, etc

Battle for the Bible by Professor Harold Lindsell

All books by John William Burgon, Oxford, including  
Revision Revised

New Age Bible Versions by Riplinger (often attacked though not much substantiated against, her own videos are available online and for Free) [Hidden Dangers of Rainbow by C.C. Is an old Standby as is New Age Messiah by same]. A Time of Departing by Youngen, and Deceived on Purpose by Warren Smith are relevant here.

Greek Text for comparison should be the 1550/51 version of Stephens(Estienne) [Textus Receptus] also versions 1860 Scrivener or Cura P.Wilson.

Canon of the Old and New Testaments by Alexander (Princeton)

All Books by George Stanley Faber (watch for other fabers)

All books by Robert D. Wilson

All Books by R.A. Anderson

Sources of the Koran by Sir William Muir is significant in Textual Criticism concerning Apocryphal and Islamic literature, though not always in other contexts.

